



THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK • BOSTON • CHICAGO • DALLAS
ATLANTA • SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON • BOMBAY • CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

THE
WAY TO THE HEART
OF THE PUPIL

BY

DR. HERMANN WEIMER
RECTOR OF SCHOOLS, BIEBRICH ON RHINE

AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION

BY

J. REMSEN BISHOP, PH. D.
PRINCIPAL EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, DETROIT

ADOLPH NIEDERPRUEM

HEAD OF GERMAN DEPARTMENT, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL
DETROIT

WITH SPECIAL AUTHORS' PREFACE FOR
AMERICAN READERS

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1913

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1913,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Set up and electrotyped. Published May, 1913.

Preface for American Readers

THIS book found in the land of its origin, and also, far beyond the limits of the German language, an enthusiastic reception. The public has given it almost undivided applause. Only here and there my statements have been doubted. As these doubts were expressed to me in private, I feel it my duty not to keep silent regarding them, in order that my American reader may know what they are. This also gives me an opportunity to correct some wrong conceptions of my meaning.

The following objections to my conclusions have been made:

1. One critic contends that with love alone we could not educate the young. Fear is an important means of education. "But," my critic says, "you oppose its use as such." If the critic had read my book attentively, my statements on pages 34 and 89 would have shown him his error. Indeed, I have found through experience at conferences, that some colleagues regard me as the apostle of soft-heartedness. They confuse the idea of living warmth of heart with

weak-willed kind-heartedness, although I have sought, on pages 45 and 49, to correct the mistake. They think of energy only in combination with a certain amount of heartlessness. Yet a determined will manifests itself only in tenacity of purpose, and this virtue a feeling man may have, as well as the hard-hearted.

The first and greatest preacher of charity was certainly not a man of wax. He carried on a war to the knife with his enemies, the pharisees and scribes. In Pestalozzi do we always see only his good heart? Did he not stick to his life work with unexampled tenacity, until his last breath?

2. This brings me to another objection. Some one has said: "We cannot all be Pestalozzis. You demand too much. You erect an ideal which nobody can realize." In answer, I ask: "Is there any ideal that can be realized?" Aims, yes, but ideals, no. In ideals we find models of perfection which may exist in our minds, but not in the actual world. Should we reach them, they would no longer be ideals. Therefore should we abandon our ideals? Not if we are to remain human beings worthy of the name. There is no spiritual action which is not, in final analysis, dependent upon ideals.

Science strives, as we know, fundamentally for the knowledge of absolute truth. Every adept of science knows that this is unattainable. If science should, on this account, renounce its endeavors, it would be compelled to abandon all striving after truth, and that would mean its speedy collapse.

In what does the value of ideals consist, if they are unattainable? Chiefly in this, that they give us the direction in which our thinking, wishing and acting move. Without a certain guidance, we do not walk, but reel through life, just as chance pushes and drives us. We become the plaything of very different influences. Even ideals cannot guard us against mistakes and faults. No man is so clear-headed and strong of will as not to be misled from the appointed road. But, as the compass-needle is attracted to the right or left by iron, and yet always turns back to its old direction, so he to whom the ideal is not a vain idea, but the helm of his life, will always find, often after periods of uncertain wandering, the right path. This path leads him forward and upwards. He does not irresolutely accept things as they are, but moulds them as he wishes them to be. Clinging to his ideal, the teacher finds therein, during

his career, a spur toward becoming better and better. By this not only the teacher, but mankind is the gainer.

3. One of my critics has discovered that I have idealized the child. I do not feel that this criticism is just. In the early pages of my book, where I speak of the teacher's needs, I point distinctly to the dark sides of the child's character. Later, I repeatedly call attention to the faults of pupils, their awkwardness, their weakness, their inconsistency, their mendacity, their maliciousness, and their dislike of sustained and earnest work. Read pages 2 and 39. It was not necessary to complain of these things on every page. The mental and moral insufficiency of the child is the natural basis of all our educational work. If the child were free from all faults, we were not needed at all!

On this account, another task seemed to me by far the more important. I ask a teacher, again and again, not to see in the mistakes of his pupils an intentional evil, nor an ineradicable malice. I remind him that these faults may have been caused, partly by the natural development of children, partly by wholesale methods of "instruction," partly by the in-

fluence of home conditions. My attempt is to teach him to understand these mistakes.

I have placed perhaps, unusual emphasis upon the teacher's own mistakes. I do this because I feel that to make the teacher conscious of shortcomings is one of the most important features of modern pedagogy. In so doing I know that, in the eyes of one of my colleagues, I have committed a heinous crime—*crimen læsæ majestatis*. But here, as everywhere in life, honest self-criticism is the only way to improvement. We all know that we are not free from faults; yet this is just what we forget in moments when this knowledge is most necessary.

4. One of my critics remarks that we ought not to generalize from mistakes of individuals. There are many teachers among us who are honestly at work to educate their pupils, and of these a sufficient percentage cling to their vocation with enthusiasm. I do not anywhere dispute this, and I should be disappointed if foreign teachers should get the notion from my book that German teachers are all heartless drill masters. The fact that the book has met with a warm welcome in school circles, proves the contrary. As for the faults of which this book treats, it was sufficient for my purpose to show

their existence, and that they make it hard for the teacher to find his way to the child's heart. I had to remind my older colleagues of this, and to warn the younger. Thus, none were overlooked as harmless exceptions. Besides, teachers' faults are more dangerous than those of the pupils. The latter injure the pupil; whole classes of pupils suffer for the former. One bad teacher does more to injure the reputation of a school than twenty excellent teachers can make amends for.

5. The public school teacher finds lacking, among the hindrances enumerated, the over-crowding of classes, which must by and by render even warm-hearted, enthusiastic teachers first weary, then, cold and severe. He is right. We suffer much, even in the high schools, from this evil. In a later edition, I wish to emphasize the consequences of over-crowding.

HERMANN WEIMER.

BIEBRICH ON RHINE,
June—1912.

Preface of the Translators

THREE is afoot a subtly devised reactionary movement in educational experiment that concerns itself with the mechanical measurement of the results of the teacher's work. The financial backing of this movement probably makes it impervious to the shafts of ridicule already directed against it. If such a system as this mechanical measurement seems to foreshadow were to prevail, the long and toilsome effort to free education from the shackles of arbitrary standards arbitrarily applied would go for naught. This little book, the fruit of a long experience and a really sympathetic heart, combined with a courage such as often invites martyrdom, is a protest against mechanical methods in the general relationship of teacher and pupil. It will be welcomed by every one, teacher, parent, citizen, who stands sturdily in the ranks of those who have the temerity to dream of liberty, equality and fraternity. Education honorably employed as a means to reduce social friction may help to destroy subservience and assist in a partial liberation of man from the tyranny of man.

xii Preface of the Translators

The translators wish to acknowledge their indebtedness to Mr. F. G. Waterbury, Grade Principal of the 10 B class in Eastern High School, for his services in typewriting their manuscript.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE TEACHERS' AND THE PUPILS' NEEDS	1
II. THE INFLUENCE OF PERSONALITY	13
III. THE POWER OF LOVE	36
IV. PATIENCE AND CONFIDENCE	56
V. A GLANCE AT PESTALOZZI	74
VI. THE PUNISHING POWER OF THE TEACHER	83
VII. SCHOOL AND APPEARANCES	118
VIII. UNIFORMITY AND INDIVIDUALITY	132
IX. SCHOOL AND HOME	151
X. EFFORTS TOWARD REFORM AND THE AS- SUMING OF RESPONSIBILITY	171

I

The Teachers' and the Pupils' Needs

A FEW years ago, the editor of an important educational monthly magazine, in his New Year's greeting to his readers, declared his belief that joy in school work would be increased if the whole atmosphere of teaching and the entire relation of teacher to pupil took on a more kindly tone. Every unbiased reader will say in his heart, "This is the right word at the right time." Many teachers are lacking in kindly disposition toward their pupils and in establishing relations of friendship with them. If teachers gave more thought in this direction, there would be greater store of joy in school life.

Many a teacher will shrug his shoulders with a cynical smile and think that this advice is worth as much as if one should say to a starving man, "Be a millionaire and you will not have to starve." How shall the wretch arrive at the million and how shall the teacher acquire a kindlier disposition? How become

2 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

kinder in disposition when he is in daily conflict with the stupidity, the laziness, the obstinacy of his pupils? How feel more kindly when he sees that this endless conflict is in vain? How feel better disposed toward his pupils when instead of the consolation of being supported in his hard struggle by the parents of these children, he must even dread their opposition? He is willing enough in all conscience. He would gladly exhibit himself to his pupils in a more amiable aspect, would often gladly speak in affectionate tones that would show the children that he is not the dried up pedant for which he has usually been taken. He would gladly fill the bare schoolroom with the joyful laughter of a cheerful spirit, or at least, with the smile of good humor, if only there were not the thousand vexations of his calling, which embitter every pleasure, and make, through their everlasting repetition, a naturally patient man into an irritable teacher.

What credit would it be to him, in any case, if he were willing to be less of a teacher and more of a man? Do school boards inquire about the greater or smaller amount of human kindness that distinguishes this or that teacher? Will they not rather look to accomplishments,

to accurate, ready and imposing scholarship? Which is more important to the head of a school at the end of the year, the sympathetic spirit of the teacher or success in promotions of pupils? Of what use are treasures of the spirit, if with them one does not attain tangible results? So we drill and drill and drill, until finally the empty heads are crammed full with all the chaos of knowledge which the courses of instruction demand as their right, for the end of the year. If the youngsters rebel and do not willingly submit to the drilling, then they are addressed in a far other tone than that of kindness. If necessary, force is applied. It matters not how the result is attained; simply what is the result.

How few among the pupils thoroughly appreciate the voice of sympathy? If the teacher speaks in terms of encouragement, to a diligent pupil, saying he has pleased him, and does so often, the pupil's comrades attack him, sneer at him as a toady, and give him the cold shoulder. In turn the teacher is accused by the other students of preferring the toady to the rest of the class. If the teacher is amiable and forgiving to all, then the bonds of discipline are easily relaxed and the well-meaning school-

4 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

master soon becomes the foot ball of self-willed and reckless pupils.

Then there is nothing in a kindly tone in the school; a beautiful expression, but empty of meaning; well intended, but cheap advice, which only he could give who had never borne the heavy burden of the teacher's lot, or had long ago thrown it off and bore its mark no longer. This will be the reply of those who are still in the practice of their calling and must daily experience in their own bodies the painful suffering that attends it. Their conclusion is hard and clear, although it is decidedly one-sided; yet there is much truth in it and this cannot be shouted too loudly into the ear of him who knows the school only from the outside, and knows nothing of the thousand great and little sufferings of the school teacher. If the public would only rightly estimate the difficulties that beset his office, many unjust complaints against the teacher would be silenced. Parents would not see in him only the torturer of children, and other officials would no longer envy him his comfortable desk and his long vacation. Then people would understand why kindness is such a rare plant in our schools.

Still, the teacher must not forget that the

pupil's lot is just as hard as his, if not, indeed, harder. If this does not sound probable to anyone, let him imagine himself in the place of the child; let him try to realize, along with us, the course of youthful human life from the first school-days, and try to feel again all that has moved the heart of the child from that early time. Before the school life lies the sunny brightness of the early years. Then the young creature was buried in the bosom of the family, surrounded by a mother's love and the love of father, and of brothers and sisters. It could babble, sing, play, romp to its heart's content. It need have little care for others; on the contrary in a thousand ways its little wishes, moods and whims were humored. The child might unhindered say what he thought, ask for what he wanted, refuse whatever did not suit him. His joy was the joy of others, his little sufferings were shared by them; in short, all impulses of his soul found an echo in the hearts of his kin at home. Once in a while he received a reproving look, a scolding or a blow, but the grief over these mishaps was soon forgotten. Love was the element in which he grew, love was the breath of his life. He had not earned all this in the least, and yet took it in its boundless fullness as a matter

6 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

of course. He had a right to this love, since without it he could not have lived when he was too little developed to help himself and too weak to compel others to serve him.

Then, at six years of age, the child is sent to school, among strange people whom he has not even seen before. His companions are all children of the same age, just as spirited and exacting as he himself. They care not for his peculiarities nor for his desires. He must conform to them, whether he will or not, for he must spend many years in their company. But this is not the worst; the school itself, in its entire organization, soon impresses him as much more disagreeable. He cannot chatter and play there as at home with his mother, but must sit still and may talk only when questioned by a stranger, who sits upon a throne above them all, who alone commands, and asks obedience from all. What he teaches will, for a time, seem attractive enough to the child, possessing as he does, a fresh, unspoiled curiosity. Soon he loses interest, because it is not his desire to persevere, but rather, he longs for new and panoramic impressions. Then the teacher shows himself in his most disagreeable aspect; he demands sustained effort, be the

subject agreeable or disagreeable, entertaining or tiresome. Opposition is useless. The teacher never yields, but demands industry and obedience. What he cannot gain by kindness, he compels by force. There is no imaginable end to this torment. Year after year the work will be more and more unpleasant. Subjects of study are continually added, the number of hours of study becomes ever larger and the periods longer, and the demands upon the child's mental powers become more intricate and more severe. If even the torment for the day ended with the close of school! But no! It follows the child even into the home. There he has still a series of lessons to prepare and many a child fulfills this task with painful dread of the coming day. Will everything go well? This tormenting thought assails him until at last his eyes close in sleep.

Who is so dense as not to perceive that this gradually weighs down the child's soul, as if a ponderous mountain were piled upon it? He becomes shy and timid, and is absorbed in silent, half conscious hatred of everything that is called school or has any connection with school. We may try to explain to him that the circumstances are unavoidable, but let us

8 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

not deceive ourselves concerning the success of the attempt. The child accepts this explanation with the same indifference with which he receives any other effort to convince him that he does not learn for school but for life. Such truths have no real meaning to him, because he lacks the experience that must first prove their truth. What, indeed, would be gained if there were such development of intelligence, when the natural instincts of the young creature draw it into other paths? The voice of nature cannot be silenced by any arguments, least of all in the case of the child. Wood and field with their gay splendor, the flowery meadow, the murmuring brook, the populous streets and the heavens bending over all with their sunshine and their rain: these are the natural element of the child, the object of the child's longing and joy, not the class room with its bare gray walls. His heart is in the glad sport of the holidays, the teasing jest and gay laughter—not in the dry alphabet and ciphering of the schoolroom. An indescribable desire for living fills the soul of the child. Tell him what we may of the better world for which we hope, he sees in this earth the best of all worlds. With all the fibers of his young heart he clings

to this earth and lusts to enjoy its pleasures to the full. And we shut such a being for eight or twelve years within narrow walls, compel him to remain daily with short intervals, five, six or seven hours in the same place, demand of him work and again work—and are always ready with punishment if will,—or, more shame to us, ability is wanting!

But this must be so, many will say. Well, I will not argue with them about this. I only emphasize the contrary, to remind adults and teachers, especially, how pitiable the lot of the child really is. The child himself seldom broods over it; but the contrast between his natural inclinations and his duties is so powerful that every child must feel it. Nor can any amount of persuasion free him from the gloomy depression that weighs upon his soul as long as he is in school.

Very well, it will be said, but what can be gained by demonstrating this fact? Would the teacher bear the burden of his work more lightly, if he knew that another was worse off than he? Or shall we make him responsible for the misery of the school-days? He neither builds schoolhouses nor makes school laws. Even upon the determining of the plans of work

10 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

and course of study, he has not a direct influence. He only does his duty and fulfills his obligations by carrying out the behest of the school boards, conscientiously, to the best of his ability. He can deplore the lot of the pupil as he can his own, but he can neither change nor lighten it.

Facts disprove this assertion. In every age there have been teachers who not only have followed their calling joyfully, but have also known how to make school bearable for the children. I recall a few names (to mention at random from the history of pedagogy), Neander, Flattich, Saltzmann, and Pestalozzi. I remind every reader of the teachers of his own childhood. Were they all hateful to him? Was there not one, here and there, among them of whom he thinks with pleasure and gratitude? Only a few people detest all their old teachers; many became attached to their teachers and recall them to memory to-day with pleasure.

Let us inquire wherein lay the secret power of these teachers. Do they perhaps owe it to late school reforms, which they themselves have introduced? Then their reform should also have benefited others, and should have led them to the same success. Perhaps it is

due to the subject of study, or to the method by which they taught. This supposition, again, is not tenable, for other teachers taught the same branches, according to the same methods, but they did not succeed in giving their pupils what those favorite instructors gave them. Then the conclusion inevitably follows: that they possessed this power in themselves, and that they worked through their own personality. And so it is in fact.

Just through their simple human characteristics, they found the way to the hearts of their pupils and awakened in those hearts a feeling of fellowship that caused them to feel the hardships of school life less oppressive. To this every one will agree, who in his youth was guided by the hand of such a teacher. In the case of those great teachers whose names I have mentioned, this is common knowledge.

Here is a valuable hint for the teacher who would like to acquire and keep the joy of the work. It teaches him that the welfare of the school does not depend upon the influences or reforms from without, but upon powers that reside in the human breast. It directs his attention to his own capabilities and drives him to the question whether, as in all else in life, so

12 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

in his calling of teacher, he cannot be the architect of his own fortune. Should it be impossible for him to attain what others have attained? Shall he not be able to vanquish the misery of school life without the help of others? Surely he can do it. He need only cultivate confidence enough; he need only learn to know the powers of the human heart and what they can accomplish, if one only bring them to full development. To this end we wish in the next chapter to make clear what meaning attaches to the operation of personality in the life of a man, and under what conditions personality can assert its force in the school.

II

The Influence of Personality

NEAR the close of the second part of Goethe's autobiography, he describes how, in the garden of pastor Brion of Sesenheim, he told a fairy tale newly invented by him to his beloved Friedericka, her sister and a friend, and how the tale made a deep impression upon his hearers. He attributes the marked impression made by his story to his having told it himself, and regarding the occurrence he adds this observation: Man produces every effect upon his fellow men, that he does produce, though his personality.

This is one of the characteristic sayings of Goethe that emerge in the modest form of an occasional remark, and yet are so rich in valuable content. The thought that is expressed in the sentence above finds ample confirmation in the struggles that accompany the growth of nations as well as amid the varied happenings of every day. The march of History is directed again and again by the influence of dominant

14 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

personality. Without Christ there is no Christianity, without Mohammed there is no Islam, without Luther there is no German Reformation imaginable. The German empire of the middle ages originated with Charlemagne. The victory of Greek culture flowed over the orient upon the initiative of Alexander the Great. Who can separate the most glorious time of France from Napoleon I; the splendor and greatness of Prussia from Frederick the Great, or the new German Empire from the colossal figure of Bismarck? Certainly, these men have been children of their times, their thoughts have often dominated many of their contemporaries, and have been, as it were, in the air. But the ideas of these great men have found their most adequate expression in their own extraordinary lives and persons and in their thoughts, words, and deeds. So thousands upon thousands came to their standards, in whom the longing for what was new and great had been slumbering, without as yet waking to life; and new hosts have ever come to them, even from the camp of those who originally opposed the progress of the movement. The force of their personality swept even opponents along with it.

Only seldom has death been able to destroy the work of these men. From beyond the grave they have influenced coming generations and following centuries. He is mistaken who thinks that this duration of their influence in the lapse of time is due to their ideas or to their institutions that they have founded. Their most powerful influence always sprang from their personality. What is, to the believer, his ideal of Christianity? That being who supports him through the misery of life, who brings peace to his troubled and frightened spirit, who teaches him to believe, to hope and to love—he is the Saviour. The believing heart uplifts itself upon his words and deeds, upon his suffering, his death and his victory over death, and not upon Christian morals and the institutions of the Church. “Come unto me all ye who labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest.” This saying of our Saviour sounds to-day with the same gracious power in the ear of mankind in its hour of need as it did when first it was spoken. The most wonderful exposition of Christian theology cannot touch the heart of the penitent sinner as do the words that fell from the lips of Jesus.

Yes, man makes what impression he pro-

16 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

duces upon his fellow-men through his personality. This is true not only of the heroes of history; it is true of all mankind, of the small as well as of the great. It is only in strength, extent and duration that the influence of the giants of thought and action differs from that of the everyday man. The former spread their influence beyond their immediate environment and from beyond the grave, while the influence of the latter ends with their lives and is bounded by the narrow circle of those with whom they came in close contact.

The power of personal influence exerts itself most frequently and effectively in the daily life of the family, and here it exhibits itself in the purest form in the intercourse of the mother and child. The Latin verb *personare*, from which the terms person and personality are derived, means "sound through." And where does the inner man, his thoughts, his feelings and his will, sound in more perfect tones than in the glances, words and acts of the mother? The intercourse between the mother and her child is marked by a nestling to each other with no obstacle between, by giving and taking without reserve and by an undisturbed echo of heart to heart. The seeds that the mother

has planted in the child's breast, no power on earth can remove. It may happen that hostile influence later on may prevent their all reaching full growth, but they can never be actually cast out. But outside the family circle, the personal equation represents a power, the influence of which no community of men can avoid. This draws man to woman and binds together both for life; it leads friend to friend and gives stability to their friendship; it connects the pupil more closely to the teacher than the art which brings them in contact. It holds people together who have met by chance or business, on a walk, through a meeting or a journey, at the theater, in the restaurant or anywhere else.

Personality effects still greater things in relation to a man's official duties and obligations in public life. It ennobles a calling and gives soul to an official position, lends the physician power over the sick, which art and knowledge alone could not give him; it secures for the military officer command over his troops, and assures him their faithfulness in the presence of danger and death; it lifts the judge above the frigid law; it makes the priest a shepherd of souls amid his congregation; the

18 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil
teacher an admired and beloved model for his
pupils.

We like to speak of the charm of personality. Apparently we mean by the expression not only the obvious quality, but also the mysterious part of its influence. Indeed, a strong personality enchant^s other people, without one's being able clearly to say why and how. In school life a root of its power sends forth a plainly visible shoot.

Observation is regarded in the pedagogic world as the most important means and the foundation of all scholastic instruction. That its value in the educational field is great, is well known; but it is not always emphasized with the necessary weight and even less heeded in practice. But *exempla trahunt*. One example produces a greater effect than ten good admonitions. What do such general terms mean to the child as Industry, Devotion, Love, Patience, Confidence, Hope, Truthfulness, and the manner in which all the virtues may be named; unless they are brought within his comprehension by concrete examples,—if they are not demonstrated to his actual vision? The child has the teacher every day, every hour of the school day, before his eyes. If he is not naturally reserved, anxiously hiding

his inner thoughts from others, but one who lets the motions of his heart, his thought and his feelings sound forth (*personare*) through his glance, his words and his deeds, then his personality becomes an educational means of priceless value. He is in the truest sense of the term an example of the influence exerted by what the child himself observes. In him the child sees a model of personal conduct, a piece of real tangible life; and as the tangible in general enchants the mind and heart of the child, in this case it also captivates the youthful soul. The child receives the impressions that come to him from the personality of the teacher, with all the susceptibility, yes, with all the incapacity to resist, with which youth surrenders to the feeling of the moment. The child's own inner life becomes completely dominated by that of the teacher; the child's soul conforms to the teacher's soul; real education ensues, that is to say, a drawing upward to the standard of the model.

Many are already objecting that the portion of his teacher's life the child sees is very limited. To this objection I oppose the saying of the poet:

Small as thou art, O heart of man,
Thou canst this world completely span.

I no longer remember where I saw these lines, but, for all that, they tell the truth. Man can with his heart encompass the whole world. The most important matter is to carry the world in the heart and not alone in the head. Bare knowledge of things, mere comprehension of the subject-matter of human knowledge is a useless store, with which we can originate nothing good and with which, more than all, we can nourish no new life. On the contrary, what teaches our heart, what awakens our sympathy, what we love or hate, esteem or despise, what rejoices or grieves us, what encourages or depresses us, attracts or repels us—this kindles life in us and again in others through us. One may say, the knowledge of the world is just so valuable for us, as we find real interest in it. No one has more strikingly expressed this truth than Anastasius Gruen in the little poem which he called “Two Home Comers.”

Two wanderers traveled without the wall
Far up the wonderful Alpine slope;
The one was answering Fashion’s call,
The other aflame with an unfilled hope.

And when again the two came back,
Their whole connection came running to meet them.
Of question on question there was no lack;
“Tell, what you have seen?” is the way all greet them.

The one simply yawned and lazily said:
"Tell what I have seen?" "Oh, nothing rare!
"Oh, trees, and meadows and brooks; o'er head,
"The sky and the bright sun shining there."

By his smiling mate were the same words said,
But with glowing cheek and eager air:
"Oh, trees, and meadows and brooks; o'er head
"The sky and the bright sun shining there."

All that had left the one of the wanderers cold and indifferent, touched the other to the heart and was an experience. What the former relates with indifference the latter describes "with glowing cheek and eager air," as if he saw again the wonders of the Alpine world which captivated him at the first glance. And we who listen seem to see these wonders with him, to feel as he feels; the note that sounds from his heart makes ours re-echo its sound.

The world which the teacher must exhibit to his pupils is contained in the subject-matter of his teaching. He can assume an attitude towards this subject-matter just as the two wanderers among the Alps assumed each an attitude. As they repeated what they had seen, so he can teach what he knows. He can portray his subject without sympathy, handle

22 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

it as a mere thing for the understanding to grasp through his instruction. On the other hand, he may be stirred to enthusiasm by the things which he teaches; they may be to him not only objects of knowledge but also matters of the heart, so that in the portrayal of them he cannot separate his personal knowledge from them. In the first case he can widen his pupils' knowledge, but he cannot expect to reach the feelings, the will and the actions of his pupils, that is to say, really educate in the broad sense.

Even if the subject of teaching is developed in a most correct and classic manner, even if indelibly engraved upon the memory by continual repetition and practice, the teacher cannot on this score claim that he has proved his educational ability. Only when I, myself, feel what I am teaching, when it has become in me a thing of life, can I vitally enrich others therewith. Only what inspires me gives me power to inspire others; what I myself have felt, I can alone make others feel.

This is acknowledged by everybody in the case of certain branches of instruction, especially in the case of religious instruction. From the mere perfunctory teaching of the Biblical

stories, the catechism, scriptural sayings, and hymns, no one would expect a stimulation and development of the religious life. Only when the personality of the teacher has a religious cast, when from his heart the note of honest conviction and deep emotion breaks forth spontaneously, when his act, thought and speech breathe love (here we must except hypocrisy and cant), can religious instruction also become a living force in the pupil's soul. It is exactly thus in other branches of instruction. If the treasures of our literature, the power and wealth of our mother tongue cannot stir the heart of the teacher (let English readers substitute English for German), German teaching is the most tedious and unfruitful that one could imagine. He to whom foreign languages are nothing but a means for logical training; who pursues them only because of their "cultural value," and exhausts himself in grammatical drill, in oral and written translation; who is unable to give the children, through language, a glance into the foreign modes and feeling, in the peculiar beauty of which he takes a genuine interest, he should not be surprised if shortly after leaving school, his pupils cast out the whole chaos of half-learned knowledge, as easily as we shake off

24 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

snowflakes from our coats, without their leaving even a trace of moisture. We should demand of the historian an impersonal attitude; his personal feelings should play no part in his presentation of historical events. But the history teacher must live with his heroes, in sympathy sharing their battles, their victories and their defeats. Thus only do the men and events of the past obtain real meaning for the youth to whom a dispassionate view of historical passages and events is impossible.

Even in those branches that are mainly or entirely devoted to the observation of nature, the mingling of instruction with the personality of the teacher forms the only guarantee of a deep and lasting grip upon the subject by the pupil. Only the teacher who himself beholds lands and people with a sympathetic eye, whom the marvels of the earth and the peculiarities of its inhabitants do not leave indifferent, can possess the power of clear and stirring portrayal, without which geography teaching is a dry waste of names and numbers. Only the scientific investigator who approaches the secrets of animal and plant life with understanding in his soul, who takes his pupils out into the forests and meadow and knows how to

lead them there, amid the abundance of natural forms, to observe for themselves, will awaken a love of nature. He who expects a similar result from logical classification and system and from accurate description will wait for it in vain. Also in the case of Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics, yes, even in the case of technical branches, the desideratum is the same. One must be absorbed in his subject with all his soul, if he wishes to win for it his pupil's heart.

Nature teaches us daily that everything which is to germinate and grow needs warmth. It is exactly thus in school life. Instruction that leaves the pupil cold has missed its mark. Children desire warmth. They cannot feel interest in any subject that is treated unsympathetically by their teacher. Utilitarian and uninteresting are synonymous terms in describing effect upon the child-mind. Only a teacher that becomes enthusiastic over his subject can communicate that sense of life and warmth to his pupil which is necessary for fruitful co-operation of teacher and pupil in school.

It is plain that a teacher who wishes to come by his own in the matter of personal influence

26 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

in his teaching, himself needs a proper degree of freedom. Does not this necessity stand opposed to the growth of so-called method in teaching, which binds the teacher to fixed rules? In fact, we often hear the remark that teaching by method and the exertion of personal influence in teaching are mutually exclusive, since the pressure of method hinders the free exercise of personal influence. The truth is that whoever maintains this opinion misunderstands the essential quality of method. Method of teaching that deserves the name, must fit the laws of human mental development, its steps must follow the course which the youthful spirit naturally traces in pursuit of knowledge. The teacher who casts aside the universal custom of teaching, must also carefully follow nature's path; else, he will rightly be accused of carelessness or simple arbitrariness. Instruction, according to nature's plan, demands subordination to nature's laws, and upon this every method rests its claim. Only that over-estimation of the value of method is to be avoided, which considers that method can be the infallible guide in every case that presents itself in teaching. A contemporary teacher well says: "Method can only, for the

most part, lay down general principles, and whenever its inventors go into detail they never reach the minute requirements of actual practice. Therefore method cannot be applied directly to practice; least of all can it be transferred literally to the living work of a teacher and his actual problems."

I might compare the rules of method to the patterns of our cloth manufacturers. The suits that are made from them, and are at all times to be bought ready made at the dealers, never conform closely enough to the body to be called a perfect fit. Every human body has its own proportions which at best can only correspond partially to the average measurement of the ready made clothes. Thus the casual matter of any classroom exercise never exactly fits the model form that is supposed to be copied. Each case that arises in teaching has its own peculiarities, its definite individual character. To do each case full justice, to exploit all the possibilities of the case in hand, to utilize with independence the apparently irregular and unmethodical exigencies that confront the teacher, and yet give to the question that arises its peculiar character: for this the free unhindered play of personal power is a necessity.

The difference of children from one another presents difficulties. The numerous individuals with whom the teacher must deal are just as unsuited for wholesale measures as are the subjects of study. All children have their peculiarities that differ according to talent, will power, the interest which they bring to a subject, and the spiritual and moral atmosphere which outside of the school surrounds them at home in their own neighborhood, and which influences their understanding, their feelings, and their ambition in no small degree. How much hindrance and diversion of effort is caused by this variety of individuality in the child! How many misunderstandings arise from it? How many thoughts and feelings not intended or wished are awakened in the youthful minds which turn aside the attentions and sympathy into other paths? Such obstacles cannot simply be disregarded. He who in this case relies upon a method, and expects to have in the prescribed rules a firm track under his wheels, upon which he can glide comfortably to his destination, will soon be ditched. Method will at best be a guide to him, which will point out the approximate direction. He must himself, in this general direction, direct his jour-

ney; he must find the road passable for his flock of sheep and, for this purpose, he must often make wide detours from the straight road. Nor should he neglect the stragglers that, to the right and to the left of the way, drop out of line, but must draw them back into the column, in order that they also may reach the destination. For such work a strong and firm personality is required. He who looks to another for help, when he should himself be guide, cannot have his pupils follow him with confidence.

To be sure, if a teacher wishes to be independent and do as he likes in his teaching, without offending the laws of method, he must orient himself in regard to method. It must have become a part of his being and its laws must have mingled with his very flesh and blood. What I said about relationship of personal influence and subject of study also applies to this case. Method and teacher must become one; method must be blended with his personality. As long as the laws of method are simply something learned, mere memorized material, so long they indicate, not development, but decay of the teacher's power.

In some such relationship to method as this

the teacher stands, when he tries to teach in accordance with a previously worked-out and, if possible, previously written-out lesson. Yet, he is in a still more unnatural relation to method who does not trust at all to an independently worked-out preparation of a subject, but seeks his salvation in the printed "preparation" issued by persons unknown to him. Those who are in training for the teaching vocation, may find such a guide useful, in order that they may finally learn to walk independently in the toilsome path of instruction; but every teacher knows from the experience of his beginning years what fetters such means place upon free exercise of teaching power, and how seldom the prescribed plan corresponded with genuine progress in work. If he lacked strength to adapt himself to changing conditions, if he had no contribution of his own to make, to keep him in touch with his pupil's feelings, and to bring him, after a moment of hesitation and search, back to the right road; then his teaching failed, although he brought it to an externally passable conclusion. I still remember with terror my first hours of teaching, which I had planned beforehand with the utmost accuracy. When I started to teach

according to the rigid scheme of my model lessons, it was as though I came before the pupils with tied hands, unable to lift up the fallen among them, to bring back the wanderer to the right path or to draw forward those who hung back. The lack of freedom of motion depressed me; I felt that the lessons failed of their purpose. If, at best, I was understood, in reality my pupil's hearts were as little in the matter as my own.

Well, every one some time passes through his years of apprenticeship, and then learns to move more freely. Intercourse with children compels even the unwilling teacher to work with a sense of personal relation. Time and experience teach him to assume the correct attitude toward method. If he makes method a possession, which he can control like one of the organs of his body, he can then allow himself to develop to full strength, without falling into carelessness. Carelessness results only if the teacher neglects the natural laws of teaching as they are expressed in what we call method.

Other difficulties in the way of the exercise of personal discretion in teaching arise from the official position of the teacher. This aspect of the teacher's vocation is more prominent

in our times than ever before. The taking over of schools by the state, the tendency which this produced toward a rigid organization, manifested in the issue of uniform courses of study and examinations as well as in other regulations, and in the strict requirement of compulsory attendance; these things have contributed to stamp the teacher as a school official, who no longer is accountable only to God and his conscience, but also to official superiors. The body of modern teachers has easily reconciled itself to these conditions, since they brought with them many external advantages. The teachers have gained in public recognition, and their material comfort has been greatly increased. But their relations to youth has now become many times more formal, colder and more unsympathetic (like all intercourse governed by law, official relations bear the stamp of the impersonal). A teacher who feels himself to be an office holder, directs his efforts first to obtain the approval of his superiors. With literal correctness he fulfills his duty in the instructions of youth intrusted to his care, and the opinion of the school board regarding his performance is weightier with him than the question of his personal relations with his

pupils. His tendency is to see in them only the material upon which he may prove his skill.

Many teachers hug the delusion that through emphasizing their official position they lend importance to their educational work. The respect for persons in official positions is born in the blood of the German. But this respect does not unite, it separates man. It keeps the common man at a respectful distance from the office holder. And as for the children, they have no kindly feelings for the official uniform. They close their hearts against such high mightiness; for they are afraid of it, just as they are afraid of the grotesque mask, even when they know the wearer. And when the child has no confidence, it is useless to talk about educational influence.

Superficial observation of these matters may lead to the conclusion that the facts are against me. When an observer finds daily in the school life boys and girls worrying about the teacher, he may believe that the teacher's personal influence pierces the shell of his office. The teacher forms for his pupils the center and circumference of school life. They see all things incorporated in his person: knowledge, power, and force. They learn for him alone, not for

34 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

the school, which is an abstract idea; not for their later life, about which they trouble themselves very little as yet. But they work for the teacher, for he decides every day upon their performance; from his lips fall praise and blame, and in his hands is their fate at the end of the term. He only, in a word, gives the work of the day its aim. It is only through fear of his power that they are good and orderly, not out of native or acquired virtue, and as soon as they believe themselves unobserved by him, the youthful spirits of most of them venture forth. With astonishing acuteness they follow his movements, his glances and his expression. They neglect none of his peculiarities, they are familiar with his moods and his weaknesses. They know all about his severity, his kindness of heart, his irascibility and his indifference. They conform their own conduct thereto.

But let no one be deceived by appearances. Rather, let every one observe how the same pupils comport themselves after they have turned their backs on school. For many of them the teacher is a fallen idol, a dethroned prince, or nothing at all. How many fellows then pass their former master, look him boldly in the face and then cut him, as if they would

say, "We are quits; you have nothing more to say to me." Certainly one would answer such foolishness with a smile, if he noticed it at all, but it proves that the pupils' former attitude to his teacher was pure hypocrisy. The personal interest which he took in his teacher was at best superficial. It was forced upon him because he had to reckon with the authority vested in the person. When the authority of the teacher has collapsed, we recognize that it rested only on the clay feet of office.

It is plain from these reflections that the power which his office gives to the teacher, conceals within it a great danger. It may conjure up for him a personal influence that has no material existence. He who would protect himself from such delusions will take care not to make his official position too prominent in the eyes of his pupils. On the contrary, he will be anxious to keep the barrier of officialdom from coming between his pupils and himself, that the only true educational force, the greatest that we possess, the force of personal influence, may exert itself unhampered.

III

The Power of Love

WE have not yet spoken of the ground note that must accompany personal influence of teachers and pupils, that alone gives this intercourse the character of spontaneity or genuineness. Powerful as the force may be that personal influence can radiate forth, one is not always either able or willing to exert it upon others. What we mean by the term personality embraces the original existence of man, his inmost and best, the sanctuary of his soul. We do not parade this in the public market place, and we shrink from desecrating it through exposure before the Philistines: especially do we Anglo-Saxons and Teutons incline to a coy reserve in displaying the inner man. We do not estimate very highly the man who wears his heart on his sleeve. Our social training has exaggerated our natural reserve. The heart must urge us strongly before we venture to step out of ourselves, at least in the case of people not related to us. We can throw off the husk

of natural and customary reserve only when we feel ourselves drawn to others and when they are close to our hearts.

Affection for his pupils would be, then, essential to an unconstrained personal relationship between the teacher and the pupils. By this is not meant an arbitrary affection shown to one child and withheld from another. Some pupils are agreeable to us through their talents, their good work, their proper behavior, and even because of a prepossessing exterior, while others by lack of some advantages arouse in us antipathy. If we would yield to such feelings in our dealings with our pupils, we should be unjust. The hearty sympathy that is expected of a teacher must be bestowed upon all the pupils, the stupid, the lazy and the ill-bred, as well as upon the talented, the industrious and the good. It must be like the dew which "falls upon roses and upon nettles." It must be given at all times, whether the pupils please or annoy us. Our sympathetic feelings must become a power in the soul, that will help to support the child with all his faults and failings, that will be able to draw the child close to our heart, even at those moments when he sees in us his enemy and shows himself our

38 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

enemy. For this force the term affection is all too weak; it is love.

The teacher must love his pupils. This stipulation is not new; on the contrary it is exceedingly old. We meet it under many guises in the writings of pedagogical authors, great and small. But he who makes an unprejudiced examination of actual life, both of our own and of former times, will find that this promise is relatively seldom fulfilled. Precisely, because its fulfillment is very difficult. By the mere commandment, "thou shalt love thy pupils," no service is done the practical man. Such a man must be taught the way of love, else the demand is nothing but a meaningless phrase. And the pedagogical theorists have not yet solved the problem. Some remind us that the teacher, by his love for the pupils, only fulfills his duty as a Christian. This reminder, to judge from results, is not sufficient means to bring about more tender relations between teacher and pupil. Other authorities apparently take the stand that possession of this power to love is a matter of course, about which we need not trouble ourselves at all. The more honest among them frankly admit that this love is a gift of God, which a man has

or has not, a gift which no one can acquire through the help of others. Some such sincere confession makes itself heard in the words of Hamann, when he says that all principles of the teacher's art are useless, and that, as we say in common life, the real teacher is blindly in love with the children, and loves them without knowing why.

If Hamann were right, most teachers might well despair of success in their work. Most of them might well fold their hands in their laps, depressed by the consciousness that the best in school life was denied them. For what we commonly call love for children is indeed shared by most people, but it is nothing more than liking for the child so far as the child gives us pleasure. It is too not the strong inner force that can hold in the same regard the troublesome and obstinate child, the child of whims and moods, the malicious child, the awkward child, the unsocial child and the child reluctant toward work. The empire of this love has descended only to a chosen few as an unearned gift of God. Yet it is an absolute need in the school. If every one could not acquire it, to reckon it an indispensable factor in education would not be right. I shall

40 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

try to point out a feasible way to this goal for every one.

To this end, I must once more remind the reader of the yawning gulf between the natural inclinations of a pupil and his sense of duty as I have called attention to it in a previous chapter. Every teacher must know what mental suffering and heartache this conflict between "must" and "want to" places the child. Every one of us has had this painful experience in his own youth. We have felt the same longing for liberty and independence in our hearts, which fills theirs to-day. The everlasting "musts," learning, obedience, attention and sitting still weighed with the same discomfort upon us as upon them. In a word, their distress has also been ours. He who still remembers his own childhood, each period with its desire and its pain, its good will and weak powers, its impulse toward freedom and the suppression which it suffered, will not be barred from the path to the child's heart. It is just this that has power to open the gate to the right road. If the pupil's distress calls before my eyes the suffering of my own childhood then I am able to feel it again with him. Sympathy is the strongest and purest source of love; it is the

indispensable condition of that devotion, which has no other object than to help, liberate, and redeem. Nay, it is something more; it is the infallible guide and the powerful path-finder that leads our heart over all obstacles to the heart of the pupil. For it compels him whom compassion for the child has once seized, to help whenever he can. He thinks no longer of himself and his cares nor does he ask beforehand for thanks and rewards, or complain of the weakness and faults of the children committed to his care. He sees in his pupil only a creature imploring help and stretches out to him the rescuing hand to free him from his distress.

The teacher's relation to his pupil has then undergone a complete change. With the love that unbidden and unobserved has crept into his heart, he has become a new creature. He feels himself a power to save and has a consciousness of force. He feels himself rich in conscious power to satisfy hungry hearts and does not hesitate to exercise his power without limit, since his resources are inexhaustible. The consciousness of being able to be the pupils' friend, their protector and counsellor, their helper and stay, must give the teacher wings that can al-

42 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

ways bear him aloft in spite of the difficulties of his work. He who has gained this relation with his pupils has reached the highest and the best that he can attain in his vocation. See in the child your own self in your youth, and you will learn to love the child. This in brief is the way that leads to love of children. It is practicable for normal men and women, if they once really wish to pursue it. The transformation cannot take place in a day or two, surely, and the mere intellectual perception of the troubles of the child being once ours has not in itself alone the power to make the teacher into another person. The main thing is that the truth takes hold upon the teacher's heart and makes him capable of sympathy with the child's lot. The soul's experience of the truth must be added to the intellectual acceptance of this truth. He who is not capable of vivid recollection of his own childhood should renounce the office of teacher. For the man to whom his own childhood has become strange cannot understand the nature of the child. The land of childhood remains to him a strange land. How shall he be able to guide anyone therein?

People who do not understand one another are unfit for co-operation. They are mutually a

burden, because each wants his own way. Friction causes annoyance, and annoyance easily grows into hostility and hate. How many bitter struggles between teacher and pupils can be traced to the teacher's inability to understand the nature of his pupils and to his being unable to put himself in their place.

On the other side are a few fortunate teachers who do not first have to acquire a love for children, but have it as natural gift, for their lives are in feeling close to the child. They have preserved in sober manhood the most precious treasure of the dreamland of their youth; they have retained their childlike soul. From this inner relationship with the nature of the child is derived their understanding of the child-soul as well as their instinctive sympathy with youth and their participation in the child's joys and sorrows. It is plain to every one that knows the life history of our greatest educators that they have preserved to old age many genuinely childlike traits. Of all these the one that excelled in his gift of devotion to youth was Pestalozzi, the "grown up child," as his pupil and follower Blochmann strikingly calls him, gifted with all the nobility of the child nature, but also possessing the weaknesses and incomplete-

44 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

ness of child nature. He was as guileless and confiding as a child. He is called in another part of Blochmann's book, "mild and pleasing, tender-hearted and affectionate." His charm was often ravishing, and his childlike simplicity made him, as often as it could act freely and without restraint, yield easily to affection.

What I call love for children is not different from what Jesus demands of mankind in general in our dealings and with others. It is the Christian love for our neighbor so far as it concerns the child. So I do not place myself in opposition to those who demand love for the pupil as the teacher's fulfillment of the most important command laid upon him. I have merely endeavored to point out the way that naturally leads to this favorite goal. Is it not the same that the Saviour at least hints at in his commandment? For when he says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" the command also includes "Put yourself in your neighbor's place: and you will learn to love him." We cannot love our neighbor as ourselves, if his sorrow does not remind us of our own and thus make us capable of compassion and of that dynamic form of compassion that urges us to help and to save.

Next, what can love accomplish in the school? In answering this question we shall carefully refrain from exaggeration and therefore shall state at once what it cannot do. It cannot make the school a "Paradise." School is not the Garden of Eden, and can never become an Eden—as little as our whole life here on earth can be called a paradise. It contains enough of trouble and bitterness that is not to the child's taste, but must be accepted by the child. It would be a belittling of the value of Love, if we saw in Love only a means directed toward the sugaring over of the bitterness of school life. It were a pity to use it as taffy. On the contrary, it demands honorable avowal of all real difficulties; it demands sincerity and truthfulness. Schleiermacher says somewhere in his letters: "The whole secret of education is summed up in love and truth." It can be stated more concisely, "is Love." For these two virtues are not to be separated. Love and untruthfulness make a team with which no one can plow; they pull in different directions. Sincerity is an attribute of love.

Love makes the teacher, to begin with, sincere towards himself. It teaches him to search his own heart and give heed to his own faults

and weakness which only too often are the hidden cause of hopeless misunderstanding between him and his pupils. It is not politic in a book intended for teachers and dependent upon them for their approval to touch this sore spot. Yet it must be done. Many teachers are ever complaining about the faults of their pupils, as if they were the cause of all their misery in school; they are strangely silent concerning their own failings. Not that they consider themselves faultless. They are not so arrogant as that. Only they do not ask themselves where their faults lie, and if, as sometimes happens, they know this, they do not think these faults of sufficient importance to affect their pupils. So they still use unlimited indulgence toward themselves, an indulgence which they would call weakness if exercised by them toward their pupils. Let me refer to ~~an~~ everyday occurrence. It is a threadbare example, but has lost nothing of its force. If a pupil arrives tardy at school he is rightly blamed; in case of a repetition of this tardiness he is severely punished and has sometimes to endure, besides, offensive remarks about the carelessness of his parent's household, etc. If a teacher is tardy, it is a horse of another color. That may happen oc-

casionally. As is alleged in excuse, a man is human and not a wound-up clock keeping time to the second. The principal of a school who reproves us for such a lapse, is pedantic and fussy. If, however, the boys use their minutes of liberty, caused by the tardiness of the teacher, for noise and play, and are caught in the act, then some one arrives like a thunderbolt and the children must atone for what the teacher did. He who loves the young does not love punctuality because the regulations command it; but because he is unwilling to allow unseemliness of any kind in his class. Another example. We do not tolerate whims of pupils and rightly so. Capricious children have a hard time in school. The pupil is not permitted to refuse what is distasteful, nor to demand anything that is not offered. He must learn to obey. But do the teachers always keep their temper and maintain their self-control? This question is not put to the nervous, excitable gentlemen who, yielding to the momentary impulse, at once mutter and thunder, flash and strike, and soon after laugh and joke. Such diseased natures do not belong in school, but in the sanatorium for the nervous. I shall put the question only to the teachers of sound mind and

body, of whom we may expect even temper and self-control. Do these sometimes give way to personal exasperation? Are their ebullitions of wrath always only a just expression of anger at actual and serious offenses committed by pupils? Are they not more frequently exhibitions of bad humor? Do not personal anger, domestic cares and annoyances, temporary discomfort, discontent at the burden of work, impatience, or even ill humor over the slightest disturbance of our comfort, mar the poise of our minds, so that a tempest easily breaks impartially upon all? The teacher that loves children will guard himself carefully in this matter, to fortify himself against injustice toward his pupils.

It is certainly worse when this yielding to ill humor on the part of the teacher proceeds from conceit. The external power given the teacher by his office conceals the great danger of leading imperious natures to reckless exercise of arbitrary power. It forms the soil in which the species of school tyrant who is as abjectly feared as he is well hated, thrives luxuriously. I shall not express myself further here concerning the contemptible acts of such despots, for I must deal with them in another

place. I only wish to emphasize the fact that a teacher who loves his pupils will carefully guard himself from misuse of his authority not only because he fears estranging the hearts of his pupils in this way, but also because he is unwilling to cultivate in them a servile spirit that is closely related to hypocrisy and eye service, and smothers all good seeds in the human breast.

Just as little will the teacher be weakly indulgent. True love must be coupled with authority, not necessarily the external authority which the office furnishes, but with genuine authority that is founded upon the superiority of our aims, our knowledge and our capacity. Fickle youth needs, for its own welfare, strong leadership. He who cannot oppose a firm will to the inconsistent desires and changeable inclination of young pupils will soon become the plaything of childish restlessness. At this point we must not let slip the opportunity to fore-stall a possible confusion between love and good nature. Good nature has no connection with loving devotion and care for our neighbor's welfare. Good nature is fundamentally of a selfish character. It is a consequence of weakness and love of ease. The merely good-natured

man is also careless regarding truth; he lets five be an even number if thereby he is spared discomfort or special exertion. Genuine love on the contrary, will not deceive itself or others. It desires to help others by honorable means. It knows no regard for comfort, either its own or another's. A teacher who is governed by love for the young, will not spare them any pain that he considers necessary. He knows that the gods have placed toil as a guard over excellence. But he sacrifices all his powers for his pupils—works with them. This he does not for the sake of example (this intention often leads to self-complacent posing), but through the perception that pupils are weak and immature and cannot reach their goal without this co-operation.

Love accomplishes something else that a good teacher cannot dispense with. He who wants to help others must know where they need assistance. In this truth is contained the requirement of the teacher that he make himself familiar with the peculiarities of his pupils, that he observe them so closely as to be able to help them at the right time and in the right way. If he loves children, the requirement means no special effort on his part and no trouble for

him; but the sympathy he has with the children rather urges him toward affectionate understanding of child nature and intelligent perception of the individual characteristics of different children. Love gives to the teacher such insight as he cannot obtain from the careful study of child psychology. Love makes him follow his pupils forth with a gardener's delight in the growth of his plants. It sharpens his eyes for every impulse of good will and every sign of initiative. It teaches him to search for the hidden causes of the child's transgressions and gives him the combination of tact and delicacy that is needed to probe these causes. It teaches him the limitations of the child's capacity and energy, and guards him against putting too great a strain upon young brains. And, besides, it gives him the knowledge that no one treats children justly, who would press all in the same mould, but that we treat children with justice only when we take into account the peculiarities of each individual.

Love also underlies the beauty of intercourse between teacher and pupil. What is often praised as "pedagogical tact" is not only social and moral force acquired by experience and exercise; it also finds its source in genuine good

will toward children. A man may be very exact in social forms and yet be tactless if he lacks heart; heart alone is the safe-guard against breakdown of the school machine. In school frequently conventional routine passes for "pedagogical tact." This is a sham, for the really tactful person must be unselfish, and must possess the faculty of putting himself in another's place, to enter into another's feelings and plan his words and conduct accordingly. Love alone can give the power for this—love that seeks, not its own but another's advantage. Its care is right sentiment toward the pupil, and from this comes the seemly tone of a school. Especially in critical cases it gives aid and support to the teacher and protects him against passionate outbursts of impatience, the consequences of which are often repaired with great difficulty. The service that it renders him in the carrying out of punishment will be discussed in another place.

Naturally, the teacher who really loves children, will not misuse the treasure of his heart to court the favor of pupils. Without any thought of return, he gives willingly to his pupil what he can. Seeking the cheap applause of the young could only be the aim of selfish

natures; love rejects all such overtures. Yet love is delighted with the gratitude which is expressed in the responsiveness of the child. In this it shows its wonderful power to kindle love in its object, melting the icy barrier that surrounds the untouched heart. All men that have retained a spark of natural feeling, understand the language of love. Least of all are children deaf to this language. Their home has taught it to them in familiar fashion; they grow up under its influence. They are doubly rejoiced to hear it again where they least expected to hear it. Confiding affection and devotion are a necessity for the child. He who knows how to meet the child half way has conquered his own heart, and the child's heart turns to him without reserve.

It is obvious to an observer that the child seeks to give proof of his affection for his teacher. The most certain and most natural proof of his love is his tractability, his readiness to satisfy his teacher not only in the matter of conduct but also in diligence and attention. "A boy learns willingly only from the teacher he loves," says Rückert in the "Wisdom of the Brahmans." What he likes to learn is naturally easier to learn than what he is under compulsion to learn.

54 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

Work does not, indeed, in this manner become play, but where there is good will, there perseverance flourishes and with it confidence in his own ability. Where love thus prepares the soil in the child's heart, the field is ready for the success of our educational work. Mutual understanding and mutual good will lead to harmonious co-operation of the teacher and pupil and awaken that joy in school life which till now has been so sadly missed.

It is impossible in this chapter to describe all that love can do in the school. Much of this will be mentioned in succeeding portions of this book without even then, by any means, exhausting the theme. Just one more observation in this place. The Englishman, Henry Drummond, in a much read booklet, calls love, the finest thing in the world. If it really is this (and I have no doubt of it), then it is also the finest thing in the school. There is nothing more genial in all the world than an affectionate heart. Such a heart hides in itself marvelous powers. Whence these powers come and how they work, no one can explain to another. But there they are, and they conquer hearts. Happy the teacher who knows how to speak the language of love in his school. Its walls

may be bare and cold, its rules dry and rigid. For these reasons must the hearts of those within be also cold and unfeeling? Bring love into the halls and you let enter sunshine and warmth!

IV

Patience and Confidence

MANY teachers will wish to protest at this point that all is not accomplished in school by love alone. Assuredly not, but without love nothing at all is done. The art of Education requires a formidable number of pedagogical virtues, and Educationists never tire of holding these virtues before the teacher's eyes as indispensable requirements. But which of these theorists gives the teacher the strength to practice them? The mistake is that of the pre-christian philosophers, who recommend to mankind the acquisition of unrelated virtues without being able to make ready the ground in which they are to grow. This was also the defect in the law-abiding piety of the Jew, which required religious attention to a hundred separate rules, but did not make men strong to keep them. Then came Jesus and showed the world by precept and practice that love is the fulfillment of the law, and that the heart must first melt in the glow of love before man wants to observe

what the Jews called the commandment of God, and the heathen philosophers, virtue.

It is the same in pedagogics. If we give the teacher a multitude of single instructions, without bringing them under a unifying principle, we give him nothing. These single rules remain external commands which are too easily forgotten at critical times. In his relations with others, a man cannot observe a hundred petty regulations to guide the theory and practice of conduct. There must be in us a fundamental principle by which we regulate our attitude to our fellow-men. Just so the life work that each of us undertakes must be viewed from one glorious standpoint, which we must not lose sight of in the multitude of single tasks, if we are not to be the plaything of varying impulse. So in teaching, love must prepare the common soil, in which all educational virtue takes root and draws from it the sources of nourishment. Love is the soul of the teacher's art. Would patience, confidence, kindness, and good will be conceivable without the foundation of love? They are only the branches from the same trunk, mere beams from the center of illumination. Love that did not exhibit itself in patience and confidence would not deserve the

name of love. Patience that is born of love has no limits, it "never ceases," like love itself.

Children put love to its severest proof. Only the teacher whom a sturdy affection for the young enables to endure all the defects of child nature can stand the test. The school requires steadiness and perseverance, while the natural characteristics of youth are changeableness and fickleness. Pupils are supposed to be quiet in their conduct as well as in their work but the heart and head of the young are full of unrest. They are supposed to follow instruction with concentrated attention, but their spirit is so susceptible to impressions from the outer world, that every movement of a neighbor, every sound from the street can divert their attention. They are supposed to be consistent in feeling and purpose; they by nature incline to impatient digression and to swift, inexplicable change. Body and soul are still subject to instinct, and power of resistance is still small. How many conflicts arise between inclination and duty, and how often a yielding nature succumbs to inclination! Good will ever proves to be weak, and the child falls back into the fault, which the teacher imagined had been eradicated by precept, admonishment or punishment.

This looks like stubbornness and malice, and drives many a teacher to sheer desperation. It drives him to the severest measures, to a reckless and bitter warfare with youth, a war without prospect of victory.

Only he who regards the young with the eyes of love, recognizes the real cause of most blunders, namely, childish weakness, and learns to bear this with patience. He looks back upon his own youth and remembers how difficult it was to rid himself of his faults. It perhaps occurs to him that many a weakness of character troubles him even in his manhood, so that he, a mature man, frequently falls before temptation, he who ought to be a leader and guide of youth. Then perhaps some humanity enters his heart, and, ashamed of himself, he recognizes that we never finish our education. This lesson teaches him to be twice as forbearing and considerate toward the mistakes of youth. "One must become older to become more gentle of heart," to quote a fine saying of Goethe, "I see no mistake made, which I might not have made myself."

"Not too fast; haste is blind," says a German proverb, and the Serbians emphasize this truth in their saying: "Haste is the devil's messenger."

To hasten in school work is to sin against the natural development of youth. Man develops most slowly of all earth's creatures, but to the highest point of earthly perfection. It takes him twenty years to get full possession of his bodily powers. He needs, except in rare cases, still more time for the mind, independent of assistance, to work creatively and shape things for itself. Teachers should never forget this, and should beware of impatiently pressing ahead in their instructions. It is a matter of common knowledge that hot-house plants are not weather-proof. They fascinate at first view, but their promise does not hold out for any length of time. Precocious children have, as a rule, disappointed the hopes placed in them. The history of music has dozens of examples of this to show. In the teaching by classes, such hot-house training is certainly inadvisable. It causes a nervous condition in both teacher and pupil. It excites the teacher, because the feeling of responsibility always weighs upon him, since the differing capacities of the children do not allow a quiet uniform progress, and because, besides his teaching, many requirements of school discipline have to be met. It stimulates the pupils through daily rivalry

caused by their working together, through their anxiety for success in the work set by the teacher and through the various contingencies created by the presence of so many together. Therefore the teacher should strive the harder, in his own interest as well as for the sake of the pupil, for the precious treasure of patience. "Make haste slowly," should be his motto. No excessive haste, no precipitancy! We can try to do to-morrow what we could not reach to-day, and if not to-morrow then later. Continual dropping wears away a stone. One can properly demand of the teacher that he be clear concerning the size of the lesson when he enters his class, and concerning the object of the lesson. But the teacher that insists upon covering the lesson in the hour at any cost, succeeds, often enough, at the expense of truth. It is usually plain at the next lesson, that only a part of the pupils were able to follow him. Then such teachers sigh and lament over lost time and fruitless work; they scold and reprimand their pupils for their laziness and inattention. Much rather should they blame themselves. If they had been satisfied the day before with more modest results, they would have saved themselves useless annoyance and would have pre-

62 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil
served harmony between themselves and their charges.

One should be especially mistrustful of showy success in teaching; generally it is more show than real attainment. An English teacher who recently visited a number of our schools in order to gain personal knowledge of system, says that he was almost everywhere astonished at the excellent oral answers of the pupils. His surprise was still greater when these pupils had given evidence of the results of their training, by the safe test of repeating the program of the day before, through a written examination. These papers swarmed with blunders. Whence then this amazing difference between oral and written results in the performance of our pupils? The Englishman found, after careful observation, that the excellence of the oral recitation was due to the clever questioning of the teacher and that the correct answers were "suggested," as he expressed it.

Our school authorities often make similar discoveries when they wish to determine the ability of pupils through an examination conducted by themselves. Such examinations seldom come out to the satisfaction of the examiners. The reason is evident. When the class teacher con-

ducts the examinations, he, on purpose or not, makes some connection with the work last gone over, under his instruction, and he offers the pupils many hints and suggestions that help the performance. To the strange examiner this mass of helpful material is entirely lacking. He puts his questions from the sphere of his own thought, and it takes a long time for a right understanding between him and the children to be established. We see therefore that most performances of pupils are dependent, i. e. rely upon the intentional or unintentional preparation of the teacher, while assimilated knowledge and power, independent of such help, is reduced to a minimum. We should remember this fact when we take charge of a class formerly taught by another teacher. In such cases the boys make such a showing of ignorance that one might think they had learned nothing from our predecessor. If we ask them: "Did you not have that, last semester?" the answer comes often indeed: "No." The children are in most cases not telling the truth, but are taking refuge in a lie, to hide their weakness.

He who once has clearly seen the dependence of the ordinary school work, learns to be contented with little, and guards against nervous

64 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

despondency when results do not measure up to his expectations. One must not throw up the sponge, hopeless as the struggle may seem. The teacher's love for the children must be so deep that he never grows tired of instructing the slowest and the dullest. Indeed, these deserve our special care, if they show the least willingness, and they show willingness as soon as they perceive that the teacher is kindly disposed to them and is ready to deal tenderly with their weakness. They are grateful for even the slightest real help. But *no one* has the right to despise them because of their marked awkwardness, as useless and inferior creatures, and make them feel this contempt. It is as great as it is a widespread mistake, to regard school work as the criterion of the whole worth of a human being. The work in the class, especially the oral work, gives a very one-sided test of the pupil's capacity. It is affected mainly by the presence of mind and quickness of the child, by the ability to find quickly the right answer to the question suddenly sprung. The child that perceives readily, has a ready memory and elasticity of attention will get along well in school. These are indeed gifts of great value for future success in practical life; but for this reason they

should not be overrated. A pupil may possess far more valuable talents, depth and keenness of reasoning powers, the gift of combination and invention. Being naturally slow, he may never reach the proper employment of his talents in school. He may be endowed with rich fancy, with valuable artistic gifts, and yet, from the very brilliance of his imagination and because of his artistic temperament, he may be a poor student. Finally, he may possess moral qualities of the highest merit, and yet the school, chiefly emphasizing the mental powers, shows no appreciation of him. Only those teachers who observe with affectionate care the characteristics of the individual child, will take into consideration gifts which have little value for certificates, and apply them in the examination and promotion of such pupils.

Affectionate absorption in the life and thoughts of the child is the best and most natural aid to patience. Many an outburst of impatience would be avoided if we would inquire more diligently into the secret causes of unsatisfactory work or blameworthy conduct. A little seven-year-old once directed my attention very forcibly to this fact. I had written a French translation in class, and had chosen for it a

66 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

passage which I had taken up in the preceding lesson, only changing slightly the tenses in the sentences. One sentence read: "During recess, the pupils played in the yard." In the original passage the present was used: "They play" instead of "They played." In order to remind the pupils of the tense to be used, I repeated the sentence several times, accenting the word for "played." Then the pupil of whom I am speaking interrupted me, just as I was going on with the next sentence, with: "Do you mean 'play' or 'played.'?" I became impatient because of his lack of attention and ordered him to be seated. Without answering his question, I proceeded with the lesson. Then tears welled up in the little child's eyes, tears of anxiety. His glances went to and fro restlessly, as if seeking help from his neighbors. He did not write any more nor did he seem even to hear the following dictation. Then a sudden and startling thought came to me. I asked myself if I had wronged the child. The French word *récréation*, with its two accents may have diverted the attention of a beginner, who was not one of the best pupils. To this was added the difficulty of placing words, that requires some deliberation. Besides, the excitement and anxiety

concerning the success of his work weighed on the child's mind and confused it. It then became quite comprehensible that although the word "played" was repeated several times, he had heard it necessarily with partial attention and that the remembered form "play" produced an after effect from the preceding lesson which made him doubtful as to the tense. It was not superficiality and indifference that had caused his inattention but the combination of anxiety, excitement and recollection of the similar preceding exercises. I was the one deserving the reproach of superficiality, since I had not instantly sought the cause of his misunderstanding. From that time no pupil asked information from me in vain.

Nervous excitement as the cause of poor work is in general given too little consideration. If the teacher would pay more attention to this, he would in many cases begin to exercise patience. The work of pupils influenced by continual fear of censure lacks freedom. Being compelled to learn is not half so severe upon children as the compulsion to demonstrate what they have learned when oppressed with a consciousness of severe criticism. What will the teacher think of your work? What mark will he give you?

These cares lie heavily upon the pupil's heart and exert a dull pressure upon his mind. His interest is directed less to the subject to which he should give his attention than to the teacher's mark. In other relations of life, we justly find fault if people look only for their own advantage. In the school we encourage egotism and selfish ambition by continual censure and criticism. This is undoubtedly the most serious objection to the written work done in the class room, that it is done in fear and trembling. Every sentence, every word may offer occasion for mistakes that one would wish to avoid. It is as if one were going over a road planted with pitfalls and mantraps. Will the pupil master most of the difficulties? What will be the result of all this trouble? Work done under such pressure should not be estimated as natural performance, and should not be regarded as a criterion of the child's ability.

What have the teachers become, under this system of censure? Are they still the friends and helpers of their pupils? Alas, they too often regard themselves as their pupils' judges. Their common work ought to unite teachers and pupils. The misuse of censure alienates them from one another, and places them in two

hostile camps. Especially those attending the higher schools have to suffer severely from this canker sore. It could be cured with one stroke of the knife by abolishing the certificates. But the authorities will not consent to that, because the higher schools will not admit except upon certificate. We should have to do away with the whole system of promotion from school to school if we abolished the certificates. It is a question whether this can be done or not, and the question is out of place here. We are to discuss in this book, not the possibility of reform, but how the individual teacher is to order his personal relations with his pupils and what, under existing circumstances, he can make of his connection with the youth intrusted to his care.

Starting from this supposition, the teacher must do everything in his power to free his pupils from the anxiety caused by their sense of being continually under surveillance. He ought not to allow his control to be felt by his pupils. The teacher that places himself before his class and proceeds to test his pupils, proves thereby that he entirely misunderstands the position which he ought to take toward the child. And yet how general is this custom among

teachers. They seem never to dream that such an attitude is unpedagogic,—a misuse of their office. On the contrary they regard it as a matter of conscience to record every false or correct answer of their pupil. And the most narrow-minded are usually the least patient in the matter. Some are even so narrow-minded as to mistake their own impatience for cleverness. In their classes, how it rains bad marks if the pupils are not quick in giving them right answers! This not only ensures respect but is a safety valve for the caprices of the irritable school-master-tyrant.

There are yet other ways in which the teacher's impatience displays itself. It may burst forth in scolding and sarcasm. Insulting words have no educational value whatever; they do not improve the pupils. Nay they do not humiliate him, but on the contrary they excite him to suppressed but bitter hatred for the teacher, to whom children are not allowed to reply with similar terms. But the abusive teacher only wants to vent his anger and gives full play to his passion. In such a man we do not know which to deplore most, his lack of kindness as shown by scolding, or his lack of self-control.

Sarcastic natures usually regard themselves as finely endowed spirits, and conceitedly look down upon their noisily abusive colleagues. But they are themselves no better. Their sarcasm is either a relief to their impatience or a pitiful expression of an unkind and overbearing nature. Sarcasm is a sharp and venomous weapon which hurts worse than a rude word. In school it is a cheap and unworthy device, since in the first place it requires little talent to sneer at a person who is not yet in full possession of his intellectual powers, and in the second place the pupil is defenseless against the attacks of the mocking-teacher. There is certainly little reason to boast of this talent for ridicule and mocking. It betrays a low state of moral culture.

Impatient blustering and storming is rather a habit of younger teachers than of older ones. Young teachers frequently boast of it and regard it as a sign of temperament. It is in fact a sign of lack of self-discipline. Vivacity and patience are not contradictory terms. He who does not believe this should watch a young mother. No one can deny her, in the bloom of her youthful strength, a most vigorous liveliness; yet in the care of her child she is patience

itself. There are perhaps in the whole of life no severer tests of patience than those which the child imposes on the mother, especially in the early years of a sickly child. And nowhere in life is the effectiveness of human patience so splendidly displayed and so beautifully shown as here. Nowhere is it more clearly proved that this virtue thrives only in the soil of love.

In the title of this chapter I placed confidence by the side of patience. These virtues are sisters and inseparable, at least in the world of education. As long as we show confidence in a pupil, so long we are indulgent toward his failings. Where confidence has been lost, patience is without its natural ally.

Confidence is an indispensable condition of the permanence of any community of men. Without it successful co-operation of the members of society is inconceivable. Thus its great importance for the work in which pupils and teachers share is plainly apparent. Confidence, like love, is a unifying force, and love is the mother of confidence. He who puts confidence in us wins our hearts. We like to repay him in the same coin. To the teacher who gives his pupils proofs of his confidence in them, they gladly open their hearts, and they meet his

efforts in their instruction with susceptibility. Children are by nature confiding. They are not so suspicious as adults, whom the struggle for life has taught to be on guard against deceit and hypocrisy. So we should not be continually looking at children with mistrust. In general, they are more guiltless and more sincere than we are willing to believe. It is only where they are met with mistrust that they reply with secretiveness and hostility. A human being easily becomes what he is reported to be. The suspicious teacher sows wicked seed. He should not complain of the dishonesty which he everywhere suspects. The laziness which he always considers the cause of unsatisfactory work will at last actually appear, and the malice which he suspects in every prank does at last poison the children's soul. He himself has evoked the evil spirit with which later he must fight in vain.

V

A Glance at Pestalozzi

LOVE, patience, confidence,—more than that one cannot demand of a teacher. He who lacks this trinity of pedagogical virtues lacks the personal devotion which is the duty of the educator. Let no one charge me with demanding of the teacher impossible things. Any teacher may acquire these qualities, if he will strive for them. Only absolute ideal perfection is denied us. If we wish a man of flesh and blood who happily united in himself in wonderful perfection the virtues which we have been considering, we must turn to Pestalozzi. A hundred years ago he was celebrated as the father of modern education. Recently, he was lauded as the great democratic educationist. He will be known for all time as the incarnation of unselfish love, inimitable patience and confidence that nothing could destroy. The teacher whose heart is in his work will be aroused to enthusiasm by the holy fires which issue from the acts and thoughts of this man. He had faults,

as was natural, which would not to-day go uncorrected by any teacher. As he himself confesses, he could not read or write or cipher with exactness. He was impractical and inexperienced in the ways of the world,—more so than most men; he was a wretched school-master judged from the standpoint of the modern art of education, but he was magnificent in love, in patience and in truth.

When the first practical enterprise of his life, the Krapp Plantation of Neuhof collapsed, he erected, in the midst of wretchedness, an educational institute for poor children, whom he wished to benefit morally, mentally and physically. To this barren cause he sacrificed his property and his reputation. People henceforth avoided him, and even his friends deserted him. This did not cause him to love the people for whom he worked less, nor to lose confidence in their educational salvation. Too poor to help his fellows by benefactions of money, he tried to benefit them through golden works. His "*Lienhard and Gertrude*" is the most beautiful and most admired of the people's books. It was seventeen years, and when he had become gray-headed, before he was allowed to show the world what he could do as an educa-

tor. He was chosen "Father of Homeless Orphans" in Stanz. He was compelled to establish himself and his pupils in an unfurnished convent, unsuited to the purpose. And what kind of people his were! Many entered who had chronic scabies so that they could hardly walk, many with ulcerated heads swarming with vermin and insects, many who were so emaciated as to be like skeletons, grinning, yellow, and with wrinkles caused by mistrust and care; some full of stolid impertinence and accustomed, through begging, to lie and cheat; others cowed by misery, patient but mistrustful, loveless and timorous. Among them a few nurslings formerly of a better condition, made orphans by the late war. These were ostentatious, stuck together, looked with contempt upon the beggars' and paupers' brats, and felt ill contented with this new equality. The care which could be bestowed upon these poor children did not equal their former comforts, and consequently left them dissatisfied. Lazy indolence, want of exercise of the intellect and the muscles, was general among them. Not one in ten knew the alphabet. No trace could be found of any other instruction.

Besides this, the neighboring Catholic popula-

tion looked with aversion upon the Protestant reformer and adherent of the hated new government. Only the old housekeeper stood at his side, helping and supporting him. But love for the children gave him strength to accomplish what seemed impossible. One must listen to the man himself to appreciate what a blessing he was to the unhappy children. "I was," he relates, "almost alone in their midst from morning to night. Everything done for them, body and soul, came from me. I performed every service, gave assistance to those who needed it, and instruction to all who received any instruction. My hand lay in theirs, my eye met theirs, my tears followed theirs, and my smile shared theirs. They were outside of the world, they were away from Stanz; they were with me and I was with them. Their soup was mine, their drink was my drink, and I had nothing, no housekeeper, no friends, no servants; I had only them. When they were all well I stood in their midst, when they were sick I was at their side. I slept among them, I was the last to go to bed at night and the first to arise in the morning. I prayed with them and taught them even in bed, until they fell asleep. They were anxious for it." In this

way he gained the confidence and affection of the children with whom he soon became one, in heart and soul.

And what was the reward of all this self-sacrificing devotion? When the French wanted a military hospital, they disbanded without hesitation the institution which had existed only for five months. Nobody asked what Pestalozzi had accomplished; on the contrary the old gossip about his lack of ability and his capacity soon was revived. They intentionally overlooked the fact that he had given up his unselfish work through force of circumstances and unwillingly. They said that he lacked power of endurance and steadfastness. But he was not discouraged by the ingratitude of his countrymen. He had seen what love and patience could accomplish; he could not abandon hope for the success of his work: the improvement of mankind by natural development of their capacities. "No," he exclaimed with enthusiasm, "Man's salvation is no dream. I will place the art of it in the mother's hand, in the hands of the children, and in the hands of innocence; and the fiend that opposes will be silenced and will never again utter a sound. Salvation is not a dream." No place was too

humble for him, which permitted him to extend his work in the uplifting of youth. He was happy, when, soon after, he could share a class room in a wretched old school in Burgdorf with a narrow-minded, jealous village school-master. And when the calumnies of his colleague had driven him away from there, he still regarded it as a friendly disposition of Providence, that he was given a position in the lowest section of the upper city, where he taught the rudiments to the smallest children. "I was told in my boyhood," he said, recalling the time, "that it is a holy thing to do lowly service when gray-headed. I shall work no wonders, for I am by no means made or qualified for this. . . . But in spite of my clear foresight that I shall never attain honor nor work miracles, I regard it the crowning glory of my life, now in my old days, to have served in this movement in a humble capacity."

By and by it was seen that the impractical dreamer was not incapable after all, as he was reported to be, and the sun of a milder destiny began to shine upon him. He was allowed to found, together with some enthusiasts, in the castle of Burgdorf, an educational institute and a teachers' seminary, supported by the govern-

ment of Berne. The school did not last long. In four years Pestalozzi was compelled to move to Münchenbuchsee, because the castle seemed to the government better adapted for the residence of the mayor. In the new institute, the Baron Von Fellenberg assumed the management. But the school then took on a different character. According to Ramsauer's description, better order prevailed there, and the pupils learned more than in Burgdorf. "But," he says, in another place, "the institute lacked the love and warmth which had made us all happy at Burgdorf." When Pestalozzi, after half a year of activity, was called by the government of Waadtland to Yverdun, all his former teachers and pupils, without any exception, followed him. The force of his personality was stronger than the external success of Fellenberg.

Now he had by degrees attained European celebrity. Statesmen, teachers, philanthropists, came from all countries to view with their own eyes this extraordinary man and his work. But the inner life of the school did not correspond with its outward splendor. Pestalozzi, with boundless patience, got along for twenty years with teachers mutually antagonistic, who fought with one another and frustrated Pestalozzi's

fairest hopes with their everlasting quarrels. Still he included teachers and pupils in his sturdy affections and never abandoned, in spite of his disappointments, his confidence in the soundness of man at the core. As an old man of seventy-nine he resigned the management of the enterprise which any other man, under the same unfavorable circumstances, would not have held for even three years.

But why do I repeat what every teacher knows? Because I know no better proof of the correctness of my assertions, since there is no grander model for educators than Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, whose whole life was expended in love, patience, and confidence. To illustrate this, I have only to mention the chief events of his life-work. Those who wish to inform themselves regarding particulars of his life, and matters of less moment, are referred to Pestalozzi's works, and to the numerous biographies that give his personal history. Such study is worth while, and returns from it are rich in value to the investigator both as a man and as a teacher. When your hour of despair comes upon you, teacher, and you feel as if you had wasted an unrequited love upon your pupils, glance at Pestalozzi, and you will be yourself

82 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil

again. If your patience in the incessant struggle with fickle and light-headed youth begins to give out, remembering Pestalozzi's patient endurance, you may renew your strength. If your confidence in your pupils weakens, his joyful faith in mankind will give you help and support.

VI

The Punishing Power of the Teacher

HE who wishes to point out the way to the heart of the pupil, should not keep silence concerning the stones and thorns that beset it, and make the road, already difficult, still more fatiguing. The number of these hindrances is great—far too great to be described in this limited space with the detail which their importance requires. Mention can be made only of the most important. Experience will suggest to the actual teacher the hindrances that impede the entrance to the heart of the child.

The first attack shall be made upon the misuse of the punishing power. Montaigne, already in his time, wished to see in the schools the rooms adorned with flowers and leaves instead of being hung with birch twigs dripping with blood. He wished that the school officers would have painted on the walls of the school Cheerfulness, Joy, Flora, and the Graces, as the philosopher Speusippos, Plato's nephew and his suc-

cessor in the academy, is reported to have done there. The school should be a place to work, but not a jail for the imprisonment of youth. The children should find advantages and joys alike in the schools, and the teachers should awake in their pupils joy and pleasure in work, instead of disgusting their pupils through loveless treatment.

This was a pious wish in Montaigne's time and is frequently called so to-day. If a large percentage of those who leave school remember their school-days with aversion, and some even with disgust and hatred, it is possible that many of them may be, to a great extent, themselves responsible for such a condition, but a large measure of blame must fall upon the institutions of learning, or, more exactly, upon the teachers. In our country, joy in school life is small, because there is so little place for joy in the scheme of the school. Providing for the children delights of the eye by decorating the interior, and by adorning the walls with artistically valuable pictures, is a principle recognized only here and there in large cities, where the pennies need not be so closely looked after. But even this does not carry joy into the school. It comes only when the teacher

brings it,—only when the tender feeling of fatherly interest in the children beams upon them in his looks, words and deeds. There the spirit of love has found his home, there Flora and the Graces are represented,—not by pictures only.

But instead of the spirit of love, an entirely different spirit, an uncharitable spirit, reigns in our schools, which manifests itself in mistrustful supervision, policelike guardianship. The attitude of the teacher in his official capacity is only too provocative of this spirit. Every hour of the day the teacher encounters the Sisyphus-like labor of noting and correcting blunders. His eyes must sweep restlessly over the class to detect inattention, playfulness, attempted deceit and a hundred other offenses. Admonishing, reproving and punishing form a great part of his daily work. Is it not therefore easy to understand how the habit of correction and censure gets into the blood of many teachers, how the endless, everlasting, petty strife with the malice and feebleness of their pupils make them into suspicious, inquisitive policemen?

This consequence of teaching is certainly undesirable. We should fight it with all our strength, if we are not to be robbed of a blessed

educational influence upon our children. I have already stated my belief that a suspicious teacher kills the confidence of the pupil, and the so-called disciplinarian, always scolding and punishing, creates only fear,—personal dread of himself. But fear is the least educative of all forces. From it never proceeds a free moral act. Yet thereby we would educate our children!

We are not voicing here the opinion of all teachers. Many of them and especially many in actual school life, regard the implicit obedience of the child as indispensable and as being inconceivable if separated from fear of the teacher. "Both," urges "Schmidt's Encyclopedia of Education and Instruction," "must co-operate in Education: Fear and Love. One alone does not suffice. Fear without love embitters and makes pupils bashful, reserved and outwardly obedient. On the contrary, where love acts independently of fear, the constraint upon the will is wanting; affection will be displaced by wilfulness and defiance, and respect will be lost," etc. That these words show a pitiable lack of understanding of that of which educational power consists, namely, love, is putting the matter mildly. I feel inclined charitably to assume that the author of this article on

obedience is simply confusing love and good-natured weakness. It is otherwise exceedingly strange to find placed beside each other two naturally exclusive sentiments, love for the teacher and fear of the teacher, as related means to perfection in obedience. How can these feelings work together? Love unites, fear separates; love makes teacher and pupils friends, fear makes the child the teacher's enemy. Everything that a man fears, he instinctively regards as inimical, whether it be really in that attitude toward him or not. How can I love anyone whom I must at the same time fear? How can I call anyone my friend who may in an instant become my enemy?

Fortunately, obedience has other and more valuable supports than fear. It finds its natural source in the child's feeling of affection and dependence. When these roots, growing in the soil of love and nourished by the child's feeling of its own weakness, are fostered in the home, then the development of obedience is a simple matter. It is true that many families fall short of doing their duty in this regard, and that the teacher must, consequently, take upon himself the task which the family neglects. But this need not discourage him. The natural

roots of obedience, of which I have spoken, did not die at the entrance of the child into school. They are not dead in the child, because they are part of the child nature. Then, to educate his pupils to obedience, the teacher needs only to give nourishment to these roots of character. Let him satisfy the child's need for dependence by meeting it with love; let him keep alive in him the feeling of dependence by showing the child that he is superior in will-power, knowledge, and ability. Thus the child will the more keenly feel his own weakness. Love of the teacher and respect for his superiority (from the child's viewpoint it may be called veneration and from the teacher's viewpoint, authority), are the naturally co-operating powers by which the child is educated to obey, and not love *and* fear.

A third party in the alliance is the quiet but definite training in attention, industry and good conduct. This is the most potent helper of the teacher and the best restraint upon youthful lawlessness. As a result of this training the pupil accepts his subjection to the school organization, with its numerous restrictions of personal liberty, as a matter of course. Thus the pupil's obedience to the school regulations becomes, so to speak, second nature.

Even with the best principles of education in operation, outbursts of disobedience will not be entirely subdued. The weakness and inconstancy of the childish will, the bad example of enticing friends and neighbors, the ambition to be conspicuous in the eyes of fellow pupils, and many other motives ever stimulate the child afresh to disobedience and obstinacy. For this reason the teacher, to maintain order and for the more decided assertion of his will, needs an external help in the form of the right to punish.

“Oh,” many now exclaim, “there it is again. Fear as a means of education is indispensable; for fear is the companion of punishment.” Certainly teachers who rule by love and authority, will, when the natural foundations of obedience fail, make use of fear as an incentive, but the fear of punishment and not the fear of his person. Nor should anyone here accuse me of hair-splitting. There is a great and real difference between the dread of punishment and the dread of the teacher. This is clear to anyone who thinks it out in the analogy of the adult’s relation with the laws of the state. No reasonable man fears the person of the judge; he will fear the punishment which the judge deals out to criminals brought before him. Or by this

illustration: a child may love father and mother more than all, but, if it has done wrong it dreads punishment for its offense. The father, when he punishes the child, does not, on this account, love it less than before. This fear of the consequences of the evil deed is certainly an educational means justified also in school, but it has nothing at all to do with the fear and person of the teacher.

When does the pupil transfer his fear from the punishment to the teacher that punishes? The answer to this question has already been given in that passage, in which the continual scolding and punishing disciplinarian was mentioned. He who understands how to govern only with the assistance of the authority to punish, he who basks in the consciousness of this power and employs it against his pupils upon every convenient occasion,—in fine, he who misuses it as a means to subdue and enslave, will soon succeed in making his pupils fear the punishment less than they do the teacher. Persons of this stamp are the most repulsive species of the schoolmaster; they are genuine school tyrants. They are persons without heart and brains, who boast that they know how to “compel respect,” from the “ras-

cals"—they never speak of *pupils*. Many of them command a whole arsenal of scolding words, with which they bombard their defenseless victims. The names of the domestic animals do not suffice them; the zoölogical gardens also must yield them its most popular specimens. "Obey orders" is the supreme and only educational dictum of these tyrants, and to effect obedience they heap punishment on punishment. Without reason or distinction they employ these punishments simply for the purpose of terrifying the pupils and making themselves feared by them. If they once establish themselves in the reputation for inexorable severity, their pupils' dread gives little occasion for exercising their right to punish. The children bow the neck and do not grumble, and the school tyrant can now boast that he gets along with little punishing. But at what cost is this result obtained?

The teacher who can enforce obedience only through punishment does not belong to any school. He possesses as little control over the minds of his pupils as the man who does not know at all how to exercise his will power. For the power he uses does not come from himself; he does not owe it to his personal superiority,

but to the supreme power of the state, which invests him with it. He practices usury with others' capital and, if his borrowed power were taken away from him to-morrow, he would stand entirely destitute and powerless before his pupils.

What wretched educational results such a teacher will produce! He does not try to find out the real cause of bad behavior, to investigate the weakness of the child's character and correct it by skillful treatment. He strikes with his rough, ruthless severity at each fault singly. As long as the child trembles under his tyrannical rule, the outbursts of wrong feeling may be restrained; but the faults of character remain, and later, when the child has outgrown the control of the teacher, burst forth the more unrestrained and destructive.

This is the more pernicious because the unfortunate pupils, who suffered under his iron rod of correction, have learned the ugliest of all vices, deceit. When excessive severity rules in a school, there falsehood flourishes luxuriantly. There lie is piled on lie, there dissimulation becomes second nature. Ludwig Gurlitt in his book "The German and His School," has drawn a frightful picture of the general untruthfulness of his fellow pupils, which he

attributes to an unduly severe school discipline. There, just as everywhere else, lies and hypocrisy grow luxuriantly in the soil of tyranny. It is a cheap assertion that the lie is the mark of a cowardly soul, and in the mouth of an always most powerful teacher, this assertion sounds like bragging. How can one expect the courage of sincerity from a weak child, if it observes that sincerity only brings it harm and that the lie is an excellent protection against dreaded punishment. That the use of this weapon spoils his character, the child does not consider; the momentary success is enough for him. After once succeeding in this way, he makes unscrupulous use of this handy prevention in all cases of need. The child is filled with boundless satisfaction if by a clever lie he successfully deceives the feared and hated man. He feels no remorse over the successful but mischievous trick. This is the revenge that he is having on his enemy and vengeance is sweet.

The chapter of the misuse of punishment is always the darkest in the history of education in Germany. How many thousands of petty crimes the thoughtlessness, laziness, lack of consideration and brutal craving for power of parents and teachers commit, day in and day

out, against their wards,—crimes that cannot be proved documentarily but can be discerned by anyone that looks with seeing eyes. The authorities try, by means of prohibitions and severe penalties, to reduce the number of cruelties, and in this they may succeed, in so far as gross offenses are concerned; on the general question they stand powerless before this great evil. Only systematic training of the teachers themselves by precept and example, and by developing their conscience, will help. Thus may be implanted a noble view of the value and meaning of the right to punish. There is much that is wrong with us in this matter. In the books that treat exclusively or in part of this right of the teacher to punish, we find along with many threadbare phrases, only here and there a passage that shows a deeper understanding of the character and quality of this privilege of the teacher, and therefore there is no helpful thought in them. On the contrary these works are filled with remarks that would make one imagine himself back in the middle ages. What shall one say for instance, when he finds in Scmid's Encyclopedia, thrashing recommended as "abridged assistance for remembering rules,"—finds it recommended not

as punishment for lazy pupils, but solely as help to the memory, as a "reminder" for every one, as the author of this striking article so beautifully expresses it. "When every one for the same fault receives, without exception, the same reminder," he says, "there the sense of a common misery prevents the existence of a feeling of individual wrong." The most cruel means of discipline that is at the disposal of the teacher is here without hesitation praised as a harmless device for refreshing the memory. Poor pupils! Horses are thus whipped to a goal in a race. Of what use are restrictions placed by school boards upon the right to whip? Yet the schoolmasters may salve their conscience with encouragement from so authoritative a source.

The author of that article has his own definite idea of the significance of punishment; he sees in it an act of vengeance. "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth!" anyone might exclaim as he read this man's words. The fact is that such an interpretation of the nature of punishment means the degradation of the teacher. By it he is, so to speak, brought to the level of the pupil, whom he repays in punishment for injuries received. To him I would

speak, since punishment as an act of retaliation has an ugly personal flavor. We speak of retaliation when the person seeking to inflict a return injury has been personally hurt, injured, or offended. Then it is the same as revenge. The author of the article in question discovers this resemblance, since he distinguishes reprisals "for the protection of outraged society," and the thirst for personal revenge. But the assertion that society is injured by school children's offenses and requires satisfaction that must find its expression in the punishment of the wrong doer is too ridiculous. Who can speak seriously of an injury to society through the children's pranks?

Other educationists probably will not listen to this idea of punishment. They see in punishment partly a deterrent, partly a means of correction of the pupil. All these interpretations suffer however from one defect. They do not discriminate between the meaning of punishment to the pupil and its meaning to the teacher. To the pupil it is a deterrent and, rightly apportioned, a corrective; to the teacher it is merely a means of prevention, a last resort when the power of his personality is ineffective. This conception is of great educational value to

the teacher. If he really accepts it, he will make little use of his right to punish. Every recourse to this outside force will painfully remind him of his own limitations. His pride will not let him rest; he will strive with all his might to increase the strength of his personal influence, in order that he may be able to dispense with the extraneous aid.

The conception of punishment as a last resort guards the teacher against overworking this means of discipline and against too great severity in the use of this means. In order to accomplish the utmost with the least amount of punishment, he will investigate different modes of punishment and their apparent effect. He will find that there are forms of punishment tending to excite the feeling of honor in his pupils, and other forms which only deaden it. It will appear that the most severe of the customary forms have by no means the greatest moral effect; that sparingness in employment of punishment increases its effect, that habitual use of petty punishment weakens the effect of punishment. Men who use their right to punish with carefulness and discretion accomplish more by a glance or a word than others by marks in class-books, detention, and thrashing.

Also the arousing and strengthening of the feeling of responsibility might be the means to prevent the misuse of the punishing power. The confidence of the state and of the parents has given the teacher a power that is not possessed by the judge in the case of the criminal. The judge can judge only after trial provided by law, and according to the principles of fixed laws; the teacher, on the contrary, is bound only by a few limiting conditions. He is legislator, judge and jailer at the same time. The delinquent citizen has unfettered right of defense; the pupil must frequently suffer a penalty without sufficient opportunity to get a hearing, and without adequate investigation. The defendant in a trial, if condemned by the judge, has the right of appeal against verdict; the pupil also has the right of complaining, but, through fear of the teacher's possible revenge, he seldom makes use of it. It is a fine field for the display of absolute power that the teacher has within the four walls of his class room; and, in view of the condition of school economy, this may not be taken from him. Still, to whom much is given of him much will be required. Increase of power keeps pace with increase of responsibility. The teacher

who knows this will be careful not to visit every mistake of the child with punishment. He might find the cause under certain circumstances, in himself. And here I return to an idea upon which I have already touched in chapter three. We can every one of us recollect from his own school time more than one teacher who had this or that peculiarity which continually gave us fresh opportunity for joke and laughter. Our official life has surely brought most of us into contact with this or that colleague of whom we know that he must be the cause of much disorder in his class. Not that we must assume the "better than thou" attitude. We all have our little shortcomings and who knows how often they have done our pupils harm?

Many disorders arise from the lack of natural teaching power on the part of the teacher. How often we attack the pupil, busy about other things, with the rude question; "What are you doing?" A clumsy and very objectionable question. The answer to it is usually a lie. If we succeed in unmasking the liar, then we are seized with angry indignation and inflict the severest punishment. Did not we, whose uncalled for inquisitiveness caused the scene,

deserve at least as severe a reproof? It was our duty to lead the pupil back to attention and order. A brief command or an admonishing look would have been enough for this, and the unhappy event would have been avoided. There is certainly no need of extraordinary genius to grasp the correctness of this simple fact. Yet we hear every day in our schools the same stupid question: "What are you doing there?" "Why are you laughing?" "What are you doing behind your desk?" "Why did you turn around?" etc. and in consequence of these questions a hundred useless lies and much superfluous punishment follow. How can the teacher successfully fight untruthfulness who through his incapacity prepares the soil in which it grows?

Another insufficiently recognized cause of unpleasant incidents in discipline is the defectiveness or inadequacy of our method of teaching. Here is an example from a large collection: A teacher ready to enter upon his career, who had given individual instruction for some time, complained to the supervising teacher of the inattention and restlessness of his pupils. At his request, the principal visited his class several times and soon discovered the cause of the

pupils' inattention. In the first place the man's way of expressing himself was too abstract to reach the comprehension of his pupils, and, besides, his utterance was too slow and hesitating. No wonder the pupils either yawned or started nonsense. Their inattention was the natural result of the barrenness and dryness of the teaching.

Who will assert that this never happens to him; that his instruction is always lively and interesting, always clear and easily understood? "Know thyself?" This oracle from the temple of the Delphian Apollo should be deeply engraved in the heart of every teacher. For the man who has a hundred eyes for the faults of others, seldom has a glance left over for himself.

Know yourself, and if only a few of your faults are apparent to you, you are nearer to compassionate forgiveness of the little sinner than to angry punishment. The suspension of punishment is also the privilege of rulers. The teacher that knows when to pardon an offense, thereby accomplishes a greater moral effect than by persisting in the deserved and consequently expected punishment. How far the individual ought to go with this delicate but most effective educational clemency, which

is also a matter for utmost discretion, no general directions can be given. Only his own experience and his own heart can tell him. Forgiveness is a matter of the heart. To be sure, the intellect has a word to say here; but there can be no genuine forgiveness, if the pardon is not the outgrowth of love.

This brings us to the best counsellor in the administering of punishment—to deep, comprehending love, which will remind the teacher, upon the occasion of the children's failings, of the weakness of his own youth, and at the same time, of the distress and anxiety which he suffered at heart in those days, when merciless punishment followed the hasty fault.

“Love is long suffering and kind” says the Apostle Paul. Applied to the teacher, this does not mean that love shall make him feeble and helpless toward the children, but it restrains the irritation and violence which so often lead him to hasty and therefore unjust punishment. We have emphasized the fact that love alone produces the patience that the teacher must exercise toward the weak-willed, variable child's soul, that love alone gives him the strength to keep within bounds the ill humor so easily roused in his heart. We must also not forget

the special service which love renders teacher and pupil after the punishment is past. It quickly removes the bitterness that wells up unconsciously and inevitably in the child's heart at the moment of the punishment, and it causes the wrath that darkens the teacher's soul at the same time to evaporate as quickly. It makes the harbored grudge impossible; it does not permit sullen wrath in the child or impotent hatred of his taskmaster. It drives out of the teacher's mind all recollection of the offense committed. It unites once more the hearts that for a time were sundered.

All educationists are convinced of the necessity for reconciliation after punishment has been carried out: at least they are theoretically convinced of this. In practice there are more than enough unreasonable and hard-hearted teachers who hold a grudge against the child for the punished offense. I remember with special aversion a teacher who in bad humor, used for years after to cast up to a child an offense that he had committed when a pupil of the tenth grade—and then merely through carelessness. The child had spattered the teacher's coat with street mud. Such exaggerations are certainly the exception, and may

in general be traced to some abnormality in the teacher; but the number is not small of those who believe that they give their punishment greater effect by reverting to the offense, after the punishment is past, with words of reproach, or else ignoring the culprit for some length of time. Only such teachers as are unsympathetic at heart with their pupils can act thus; otherwise they would not have to be told that after atonement is made, reconciliation should follow. Yet this is possible only between people who have been close to one another before the estrangement.

How far apart in this matter educational theory and educational practice are, is shown by the fact that in many institutions the class teacher is compelled to record upon the pupil's certificate at the end of the semester the reproofs or punishments which the pupil has received, so that he is thus obliged to show resentment in addition to punishment. In this way the vexation caused by the punishment at the time of its infliction is, after several months, revived and transferred to the home. It is really time for the authorities to forbid this unchristian as well as unpedagogic practice, once and for all. If the teacher wishes

to prolong the effect of his punishment let him communicate with the parents on the day of the punishment, not several months later. The class-book record has still all the value it had when conduct was marked there. It informs the class-room teacher and the principal so that the teacher may use its valuable data in judging the pupil for the issuing of a certificate. That punishment ought to be inflicted only when the guilt of the suspected pupil is proved, if in reality this principle were always carried out, would pass without mention. Alas! many teachers are prone to punish when only suspicious appearances make the pupil seem guilty. It is of little use for the pupil to make denial in such cases; the ever ready mistrust of the teacher makes the denial equivalent to falsehood. But even if denial and falsehood are often the same, can one justly conclude that they are one? From prejudice would anyone expose himself to the danger of making an unjust judgment? Let appearances be ever so much against the pupil, if guilt is not clearly proved the pupil should have the benefit of the doubt. No pupil is to be denied the privilege that is granted the defendant in public trials. Here public danger is not so imminent that we

must load ourselves with the reproach of having punished unjustly, and that we may kill respect for truth in the child. How can we instil love of truth in a pupil when in spite of his honest statement he has been punished?

All punishment is humiliating to the recipient. We need not emphasize this characteristic of punishment. It belongs to the natural efficiency of punishment. Therefore he who, after the complete carrying out of the punishment, forces the child to make a formal apology makes himself by the new humiliation inflicted guilty of superfluous inhumanity. Fortunately, this hypocritical ceremony is no more made use of in schools, and has been rebuked in the discipline of the home. If the pupil has personally offended the teacher, an apology is proper for reparation. But this will be demanded only in the case of older pupils who are conscious of the significance of their offense. Children of a tender age can hardly consciously insult their teacher.

But, however objectionable it may be to compel the child to apologize, it is indispensable, nay, necessary, for the teacher who has punished a pupil unjustly and is conscious that he has done so, frankly to acknowledge to the

pupil that he was mistaken and express his regret. The Würtembergian theologian Palmer, who enjoyed in his time great prestige in the educational world, says, however: "It is inconsistent with the lofty position which, in God's place, the teacher occupies in the sight of the pupil, that the teacher should apologize to the pupil for anything." I should think that the consciousness of having punished unjustly would remind the teacher that he is an unworthy and erring representative of God. Certainly God in this case would have little cause to boast of his representative. Further, I think that a Christian attains to eminence only when he exhibits humility such as finds its expression here in the teacher's voluntary apology. Nor does this apology injure his dignity, since he knows that courage is needed to make it, and courage has no element of degradation in it. A man's office only adorns him externally; it is the man's real self that ennobles the office. The teacher who is so cowardly as to refuse to apologize when he is wrong and knows that he is wrong, discredits his office and turns the punishment that has been erroneously inflicted into an outrage.

It is indeed, only the teacher's silly pride

that voices itself in the words of Palmer that have been quoted? The consciousness of representing God has nothing to do with it. It grows out of vanity and self complacency. The teacher sees himself each day against the background of his pupils who are his inferiors in intelligence, knowledge, ability and will, who besides are committed to his power and discretion. What a rich soil for the growth of conceit. How easily little souls imagine themselves, on this slim foundation, great and sublime. To these self complacent persons it can be suggested that the school is not for them but for their pupils, that these schools were created for the pupils and for them only. They may be emphatically reminded that they are not in reality the masters, but the servants of the school, of those that employ them and give them office, of the parents who gave them their children and finally, of the pupils who demand of them leadership and training. They must be told to their faces that their superiority over their pupils is only the prerogative of their age, and that their pupils, at present little and weak, in two or three decades will be their equals in ability, in strength of mind, yea, may be their superiors. We ought not to miss any opportu-

nity to expose the schoolmaster's conceit, in all its squalor; for this conceit is the root of many serious educational evils. It renders the development of the mental and moral nature of the teacher impossible, because it prevents his self knowledge and desire to improve. It excludes sympathy between teacher and pupils, because it is a vain dream of unapproachable greatness. It leads the teacher to boundless egotism and brutal tyranny, that expresses itself in a reckless display of personal caprice and despotism. Where the schoolmaster's conceit rules, there love and reason have dissolved partnership with education.

We have already spoken of the humiliating effects of punishment; should punishment also stigmatize the recipient? As long as we have not abandoned hope of the pupil's improvement through other means at one's disposal, certainly not. Regarded from this point of view, there is only one kind of punishment:—Expulsion. To announce the severance of all connection on his part with the school is surely the hardest blow to deal a pupil. This is the most painful wound to a pupil's honor, but it cannot be spared, in the interest of general discipline. It should however, be resorted to

only when the pupil has disgraced himself by persistence in disorder, by something dishonorable or by a crime, and when the further stay in the school would constitute a moral danger for the rest of the school. Besides the body of teachers lets it clearly be known through the decree of expulsion that the school no longer has the power to improve the pupil in question with the means at its disposal, and that it declines any further responsibility for his moral development.

The elementary school has not the same right of expulsion, but we cannot expect the teachers of these schools to expend their strength upon children who, through degeneracy or parent's indifference, make all the work of the school ineffective. When, therefore, the effort to educate certain children is seen to be fruitless, the elementary school must transfer these unfortunates to the special school or to the reform school. The decree of the judge is necessary before the child can be sent to a reform school.

Other punishments that inflict a stigma are not in the power of the public authorities. This is right, since such punishment kills self respect in the child himself and the other children are encouraged by it in uncharitable criticism, to

sneer at and despise their fellows. If it is true, as we sometimes hear, that there are still public schools in which are found benches set apart for dunces, on which the little sinners must sit, subject to the heartless derision of their playmates, it is the duty of the authorities to do away with the practice as soon as possible.

Is corporal punishment to be counted as humiliating to self respect? If we could answer this question off hand with "Yes" or "No," it would soon be settled; but on this subject opinion is divided in our fatherland at least, but not in France or the United States. While a minority, but significant for the elevated minds which it contains, condemns corporal punishment as an act of brutality, a majority drawn from all classes of society sees nothing humiliating in it, at least for small children; and therefore many make full use of it in the home. I do not state this in order to justify corporal punishment in school, but to point out the very strong popular support of this means of discipline. For there is no doubt that corporal punishment is much in use in the grammar classes and even in the lower grades of the higher schools. The simplicity and directness with which it is administered and the promptness

of its effect add much to its popularity. But all its support will not maintain thrashing in our schools, if public opinion shall once turn against this disciplinary device; but we shall have to wait a long time for this. Boxing ears and thrashing will go on, in spite of all official discouragement, as long as the home gives the place of honor to this means of discipline.

Still we should not abandon the struggle against corporal punishment as hopeless. Something can be accomplished with the individual teacher. We must not think the task of convincing the individual teacher of the humiliating character of this form of punishment too easy. This view is a matter more of sentiment than of understanding. He who has not been educated from boyhood to an aversion to it, will hardly be converted into a hater of it by arguments. Alas, the fact that pupils in his care do not, up to a certain age, see anything disgraceful in being whipped, but soon forget the inflicted blow, is very unlikely to fill a teacher with disgust for the punishment.

If, however, we convince a man, through giving him a right conception of the meaning of the discipline, he will be guarded against a misuse of whipping. He who sees in whipping

only a last resource, and stakes his credit as an educator on the force of his personality, will rarely take refuge in this most severe of all means of discipline. The man who is conscious of the great responsibility that rests upon him in the right of punishment, will be careful to choose the kind of punishment which, least of all, can be remitted when once it has been unjustly assigned. He who, along with his love for the children, retains the necessary forbearance and patience for their weakness, will look with disfavor upon a punishment that is often inflicted in wrath. Where such aversion to corporal punishment prevails, there is no need to point out its dangers—the physical and mental harm which many a teacher has, unintentionally, done to sickly children by corporal chastisement. There is no need to describe the unpleasant disciplinary consequences that frequently follow whippings. In all this the teacher himself is his best guardian and counsellor. But from him who has not attained insight into the nature and meaning of the power to punish, all beautiful phrases regarding the wickedness of barbarous discipline, all official restrictions, all threats and warnings from superiors, glance off, as blunt missiles

rebound from armor. The quickly following effect of corporal punishment, manifest daily, overcomes with him every objection.

It is a well known fact that young teachers who have just begun teaching, are more often guilty of the misuse of corporal punishment than their older colleagues. Youthful impatience, want of self restraint, and, not least, the feeling of insecurity in the face of the throng of strangers, great and terrible in their assembled numbers, explain this fact. School children are prone to take the measure of the novice in teaching and to test his energy and capacity for resistance. The standing or the not standing of this test is decisive for the future attitude of the class. If the young teacher fails to tame this restless throng at the start, he will probably remain all his life a ball in the hands of the merciless ruffians. We cannot therefore, blame the beginner, if he fight with all his might until the children submit and recognize him as their master. It is only to be regretted that young teachers in the infliction of punishment cannot find the right measure, or the correct attitude to adopt toward the class. They think that their choice lies only between inexorable severity and the tone of a bull dog gnashing his

teeth on one hand, and, on the other hand, lamb-like submission that must result only in lack of discipline. They do not know the middle way, the path of quiet steadfastness, which he alone can find who has the necessary confidence in his own powers. They are still too nervously conscious of the multitude and in their distress they roar and rave like wounded lions. Let them however once meet with success by this means, and they like to play the part of the dreaded beast, and accustom themselves to this attitude toward their pupils, as if it were natural and reasonable.

School authorities realized the great danger that lies in becoming early accustomed to the use of force, and therefore have circumscribed the punishing power of beginners in teaching—for instance have taken from them entirely the right of corporal punishment. This restriction is praiseworthy, but it does not greatly help the young teacher. Instruction in the right use of the power to punish is certainly more necessary for beginners. Their older colleagues, chosen to leadership, especially class-principals, and directors should assist and train them by conscientious instruction, as well as by their own blameless practice, to a reasonable use

of the power to punish. But instruction of candidates for teaching is often deficient. While instructors are bending their energies to the education of their normal students in method, they regard a little meager, incoherent and therefore ineffectual advice as sufficient for guidance in the right use of the power to punish, and leave it to the young teachers to find their way in one of the most difficult and important of educational problems. If the beginner in teaching commands the necessary external deference by the brutal means already described, he is looked upon as a promising teacher. When he gets into difficulties in his discipline and is obliged frequently to ask his superior for assistance, the superior shrugs his shoulders and regards him as a weakling. Yet who is trying to cultivate in this timid beginner self confidence and gentle firmness in his attitude, to lead the impetuous young teacher toward calmness and to create belief that at heart his pupils are good? How few know enough to tell the young teachers something sensible about the character and importance of punishment—to tell them how few, at the last, are animated by the pure, all embracing love that sees in the erring child a weak, dependent creature not

to be intimidated by brute force, but to be led into the right way by tender care. Just here, as I have already stated, the practice of educators is wanting. So it is no wonder that the two most pitiable types of teachers, the school tyrants and the harlequins, do not die out, the former to the terror of the pupils, and the latter to the derision of the school.

It is and remains a counsel of perfection if one says the teacher must try to get along without punishment, in his educational work. If this ideal, like all other ideals, cannot actually be reached it should nevertheless not be rejected. He certainly is king among teachers who, in leading his pupils, only rarely is compelled to use force, while the helpless schoolmaster, the mere craftsman, is always crying for the rod of correction. But it is beyond the shadow of a doubt that only negative results can be reached through punishment. Positive educational effort is certainly more important and desirable. The teacher seeking the heart of the child, should not avoid punishing him through timidity or kindheartedness, if the child needs to be punished, but should make use of his educational skill to make punishment as seldom necessary as is possible.

VII

School and Appearances

OSTENTATION, the desire to make an external show, even at the expense of truth, is a characteristic failing of the times, especially in our dear fatherland. This is one of the saddest consequences of the political and economical growth of the German people, splendid beyond all expectations. Where all things thrive and flourish, no one wishes to remain behind another; and he who cannot measure up to others in real ability, endeavors at least to keep up the appearance of excellence. Let anyone look around him with seeing eyes and he will find such externally imposing personages, filled with shallow ambitions, everywhere in leading positions among our people. They thrust themselves forward in the army as well as in the schools, among teachers, professors, judges and officers of administration. The Prussian preciseness to which we owe so much is the parade-horse on which these like to ride, especially in the schools. Who does

not know them, these model teachers whom Otto Ernst has so deliciously ridiculed in his teacher, Weidenbaum? Who does not know them, these masters of drill, who regard the attainment of mechanical correctness as the *summum bonum* of educational activities? Who does not know them, these commissioned army officers with a teacher's license, who drill their boys as a sergeant drills recruits on the drilling ground? They stand high in present day estimation; for their drill impresses not only laymen, but also experts.

On entering the class of such a teacher, we see the pupils rise in their places with a jerk, and sit down in the same way, as if they were puppets all pulled by a string at the same time. The teacher stands motionless before the class, and the children sit motionless on their benches, according to command, with folded hands. Their eyes stare at the teacher, and when a question is asked, the fingers of their right hands are raised mechanically to the height of their heads, no higher, no lower. With automatic certainty answers come from the lips of those who are called upon. Too bad that all answers are not correct! But it is not difficult to deceive strangers at least, in this respect.

One need only build his lesson according to this rule: What one pupil does not know another will. One pupil may be able to answer this, another that question of the many asked in the hour, and thus a vivid picture is developed by the careful cross questioning and answers. The teacher, playing his game, dances easily with his pupils toward the goal of the lesson. No one has observed, amid the brilliant interrogational fireworks between teacher and pupils, what number one, number two, number three, four, five, and six have not understood. It does not occur to a pupil under ordinary circumstances, to admit that he has not understood a subject; least of all will he admit stupidity or ignorance before a third person.

It is not asserted here that every teacher who strives for smoothness in his teaching, for the sake of beautiful appearance, consciously sacrifices his honesty. It is possible to preserve the best form of instruction and at the same time be genuine. But the danger of self-deception lies, in most cases, close at hand. The correct answer of the single pupil by no means guarantees the understanding of the other pupils. The wrong answers frequently are the better test in this respect. For this reason, a conscientious

teacher dislikes the quick retreat from the wrong answer and the lightly passing to the correct answer. On the contrary, he clings to the original answer, for that shows him what has been apprehended and how. It furnishes the opportunity to assist the weak, to guide the erring. This work is often very toilsome; it requires much patience and endurance; it leads sometimes away from the well trodden road, and prevents the teacher from reaching the contemplated goal of his class hour. He must stop half way when the bell rings, and can only reach in the second hour where he had hoped to arrive in the first hour. Such lessons generally do not make a favorable impression on the listener, but they have the inestimable advantage of truth and honesty. They lack the glittering lustre and rather reveal the fact that pupils are very unfinished beings whose course through school is full of faults and errors. Yet he who, for the sake of external appearance, glides over the uncomprehended, the misunderstood and the unknown, actually separates himself from the pupils. His instruction lacks honesty, without which co-operation of teacher and pupils is impossible.

Exaggerated emphasis upon formal attitude

of the body, too great watchfulness regarding position of pupils when seated, the raising of hands and the rising from seats, are as little adapted to bring teacher and pupil together as the striving for effect mentioned above. However valuable the child's growing accustomed to a quiet, gracious conduct may be, in the interest of external order, the everlasting faultfinding, reproofing and punishing every offense against order, is chilling and discouraging. People that show excessive zeal in this matter, must be reminded of the real meaning in life of formality and ceremony. It is the degree of formality in the intercourse of two persons that infallibly measures the degree of mutual strangeness. The farther apart they are the more formal their attitude, the more intimate the mutual relations become, the sooner attention to external form between them will disappear. So it is also in school. The warmer the children's interest grows in the subject, the nearer they get to the heart of the teacher, the easier it is for them to forget attitude of body. Their bodies fly from their seats, hands shoot far above their heads, and with sparkling eyes they press over their seats toward the teacher. Whoever deems it necessary to quench this

fervent zeal, may easily do so with a few quiet words. But he who in such moments has the heart to punish the children for petty offenses against external order, alienates them from him and throws cold water upon their enthusiasm. He proves himself to be cold and unfeeling in a world of life and fire.

As long as pupils must suffer under one drill-master, their lot is endurable. When at the head of the school a man is placed to whom appearances are everything, then woe to the little wretches! They will enjoy life no more. The endless criticising, scolding and punishing pursue them from hour to hour, from class to class. If an individual teacher might wish to start with a heartier tone, it is made well nigh impossible for him, in these circumstances. For a principal who is a genuine drill-master demands of every teacher the same painful order, the same mechanical exactness in the attitude of the pupils, the same "incisive" style of instruction, the same pose of external efficiency. Thus a general effect is produced, and that is always sure of a certain kind of success.

He who aims at this, sees in every pronounced expression of personality among his

teacher an abomination. His school is to work as a noiseless machine. He does not want to see it a living organism; for everything in life has about it something irregular. "Several days ago I overheard, when walking through the rooms, repeated peals of laughter"—this is the way which he has of reproaching such a teacher in the teachers' meeting. "Consider, gentlemen, what the general public will say when they hear anything like that." The side glance at the "general public" characterizes this gentleman better than any commentary. A warm-hearted man would have enjoyed such an outburst of hilarity, especially if he learned that the refreshing humor of the teacher was the cause of this joyous laughter. Can the educator find anything more desirable than humor, which may relieve tension with a kindly laugh? Whoever possesses this jewel hidden in his casket, hides a rich treasure of love. For genuine humor is inseparable from love. "No one should laugh at the people except the man who loves them." Thus Goethe expresses this truth. Alas! The converse is not true. He who is filled with a tender and active love for his fellow-man is, as a rule, far from possessing the gift of a sunny humor. So much the more

should a school principal rejoice, if the walls of his school contain such a child of light. But he only says, "what will the 'general public' say," blindly passes such a treasure by, hears only the boisterous laughter of the pupils, and feels scandalized at this disturbance of his quiet. Fortunately, the men in whose cradles a kind God placed the rare gift of inspiring cheerfulness, generally are strong enough characters to accept the reproaches of their superiors without changing their ways. But the weaker ones, to whom the fullness of the joy of life and a strong personality are denied, do not withstand the pressure of official censure. When, as a happy thought, a remark comes to their mind, likely to draw a refreshing laugh from the children, they rather suppress the remark, having the fear of their taskmaster before them.

Yet there are worse heretics than the jokers. I know more than one teacher who grants to his pupils, once in a while in the course of the hour, some moments of leisure or even some appropriate entertainment. A strict schoolman's hair would stand on end at the thought of such a thing. But he who knows the reason for the seeming laxity, will not condemn, but praise it. The teacher does not grant this liberty to his

pupils *out of love for ease*, but led by a correct understanding of child nature, which needs a short period of relaxation after each period of hard mental labor. A sensible driver does not allow his horse to pull a heavy load for hours without rest. He knows that the few minutes of rest can easily be made up by the refreshed animal. So we may let the children, when we deem it necessary, recover their breath in the midst of their work. They will make good the loss of time by more diligent work. The ten minute recess prescribed for the Prussian schools is certainly sparingly meted out. If we consider that at least three minutes in large schools—even more—are lost in walking to and from the school yard, there are only six to seven minutes of real recreation between every two hours. In high schools where, with each succeeding hour, a different teacher enters the class room, demanding the same exertion of mind as his predecessor required, rest in the course of the session is of double value to pupils. Every practical teacher should know from his own experience what a benefit rest is to the pupils, if they are granted, after finishing a written exercise, a period of two minutes for rest or chatter with each other. The little

pause often proves a great relief, after the strain of close attention. In fact they are still so absorbed in the difficulties of their examination questions, that it is impossible for them to take up at once a different subject of study. The longing to know whether this or that translation be correct, the curiosity as to whether the others "gave the same translation" fills the young mind so completely, that it would be really cruel to ask them to suppress at once all its anxiety or its joy based upon the work just completed.

But the admirers of fine order regard recesses with mixed feelings. They would be willing to grant the children the little bit of recess, if only things did not thereby go topsy-turvy. These intermissions appear to them breeders of disorder and lack of discipline, especially the longer recesses, which, by the regulations of the administration, are to be passed in the open air. Let them but hear the loud laughter, the talking and the shouting, let them but see the lively running, jumping and wrestling of the unfettered children! Spirits are out of all bounds. One might imagine that hell was let loose! Gentlemen, especially those of this sort, know how, under these circumstances, to pro-

cure order and proper conduct. They place the boys and girls in couples, and march them in long procession up and down the school yard, while they eat their sandwiches amid gentle conversation. From time to time, to put a little life into the funeral procession "quick step!" is ordered, which, indeed, is not to be despised as a gymnastic exercise.

With what aversion they will remember their school-days, who have been kept in such a jail for years, at the age when the human being enjoys most thoroughly the delight of play in the open air, where scuffling, running and jumping are the most important demands of their bodies; that are not granted, even from hour to hour five or ten minutes for really unhindered movement. I should think that they had earned this by sitting quietly in their seats for fifty minutes. For this performance costs a lively boy great exertion of will-power.

As we are talking of the unnaturalness of too great restraint upon the freedom of movement, a few words are not out of place regarding the teacher's standing in front of the class. It is certainly an advantage if the teacher, especially a beginner still unable to control his pupils, passes a large part of the class hour standing

in front of his class. Many a disorder and many a trick will thus be prevented, and the instruction will have more life in it. The more intimately the common work unites teacher and pupils, the more closely they approach each other in entirely external matters. Just as the studious pupil pressed forward from the bench toward the teacher, so the teacher instinctively moves down from his desk, which keeps him at too respectful a distance from his pupils. This standing before his class is the natural expression of the teacher's impulse to be near his class. Blind admirers of order look only at the effectiveness of this attitude. It appears to them more correct than comfortable but negligent sitting. By the rigid and austere attitude of the teacher they hope to bring about greater stiffness in the attitude of the pupils. Thus, that which should result naturally, without any compulsion, from the needs of the class room, becomes with them a requirement; the teacher must stand, must always stand, before his class. He who does not meet this requirement is in their eyes a careless person and consequently a poor teacher.

A solid front must be opposed to this ridiculous distortion of a reasonable principle. Such

pedants ought to consider what opinion people would have of a teacher who makes a pupil stand for a full hour, as a punishment. The child's parents would justly complain of such a barbarism. Why then do we require of the teacher this attitude for three, four and even five hours, which we could not ask of the pupil for fifty minutes? Even during the intermission he seldom has an opportunity to sit down, because of compulsory hall-duty or watching the pupils in the school yard. Is it not also natural that the bodily exertion required in standing for hours must have a wearying and weakening effect upon the mental ability of the teacher? When he walks up and down before his class, in order to avoid the depressing monotony of standing in one place, he acts unpedagogically, since thus he distracts the attention of his pupils and causes inattention and confusion of mind.

I am far from advocacy of laxness and absence of discipline. Thus lounging, or expression of physical and mental laziness, is inexcusable in pupils and the more so in the teacher. The habit of regularity and order is of genuine educational value for young people. Indeed, the school organism cannot thrive without a reasonable submission of the indivi-

dual to the needs of the whole. Without this, no successful co-operation is possible. But the foundation on which such an organization is founded, should not be brutality, but caution and good example. Where a representative personality governs the pupils, a person that has learned to govern himself, there discipline is easily preserved and there discipline soon becomes good custom, to which the pupils adapt themselves as a matter of course. On the contrary, a discipline that must be upheld by force leads to stupidity and formalism. It smothers the freshly throbbing life of youth which we should rightly guide, but not constrict.

VIII

Uniformity and Individuality

THE history of pedagogics yields many proud names whose bearers distinguished themselves by creating original educational ideas that towered above the ideas of the masses. Sturm, Trotzendorf, Wolf, Neander, the famous rectors of the Latin schools at Strassburg, Goldberg, Augsberg, and Ilfeld; Hermann August Francke, the father of the magnificent "Stiftungen" at Halle; Eberhard von Rochow, and his faithful teacher Bruns, the founder of the model village school in Rekahn, Salzmann, the creator of the Institute of Schnepfenthal; Gedike, Meierotto, Bernardi, Spilleke, the famous directors of the gymnasia in Berlin; all these are counted among the most distinguished practical schoolmen of whom German educational history can boast. Their schools have been living organisms in which the originality of their founders was reflected. The schools bore the special stamp of the strong personality of their founders and directors.

In the universities and normal schools the powerful figures of these men are rightly placed before the eyes of their pedagogic heirs as brilliant examples. But they seem to have found imitators only in small measure. Otherwise there would not be so much complaint of the dull uniformity of our public schools.

Formalism and the absence of originality have become irksome even to the authorities. At least the members of the Prussian educational administration never tire of emphasizing and urging reform of monotonous instruction in the high schools of the kingdom, so that the last school reform of the year 1901 is inspired by a free spirit. It does not pretend to lay down binding regulations for the course of the individual schools, and, in general, does not aim to hinder the tendency toward independence in educational work. In the spring of 1905 the Kultus minister, von Studt, took advantage of an opportunity in the House of Representatives to declare the desirability and the feasibility of greater freedom in the school system. He regretted that the teachers' councils do not make nearly enough use of the liberty of action granted to them. He asserted that the feeling of compulsion was without reason, since the

official programs of instruction offered only general principles regarding the subject of instruction, and not minute regulation. The important point was the understanding of the spirit of the suggestions, and not an anxious following of the mere letter.

This declaration reflects great credit upon the Prussian educational administration, and sensible teachers will greet it with evident satisfaction. But what a lack of independent original activity there must be in teachers' circles, if the minister finds himself compelled, in public, to beg for a less slavish and literal interpretation of his own directions! Is it not a singular situation and one mortifying to higher teachers, that our government is compelled to ask them to show more intellectual independence in the interpretation of its decrees?

A glance at the programs of the higher schools, the teachers' committees of which have prepared and published special plans of work for their schools, will show how necessary this plea is. In the "*Monatschrift fuer hoehere Schulen*" Max Nath comments on the number of these courses of study, and his opinion regarding their want of independence agrees with all that the Prussian minister had said in the Diet.

He says, of the publications of the year 1904: "What struck me immediately was the careful, almost anxious clinging to the official programs of instruction of the year 1901. Any departure, in a change or selection of materials for the different classes, or in the direction of method appears seldom and with great caution. And yet it was not the intention of the authorities to bind or limit the schools. They only intended to develop a model, an example, not to issue a command. They were rather endeavoring to give freedom and elbow room, to give individual initiative free play."

Of the programs of the next year, Nath says very much the same: "This time the programs are mainly variations of official programs, merely elaborating the material and assigning the chapters to the several classes, with complete lists of foreign classics, to be read. Briefly, they envelop the official skeleton with the flesh of local needs. Individual divergence appears only in the programs of Muelhausen and Hamburg."

Why this conservatism? Why do we not make free use of the liberty granted us? Are we unable to do so on account of our not possessing originality of thought? I think not.

But we lack the independent courage, the self-confidence, without which independent action is impossible. We have lost this, and it is the fault of the ministers themselves that we have lost it,—not the present ministers, but those who preceded them. How many orders, regulations, directions and restrictions have been issued and sent to staffs of teachers of the higher and common schools. With anxious care the supervising authorities have watched the carrying out of the programs, and the attention paid their edicts. Even the smallest matters were subject to regulation. Almost nothing was allowed to be done or left undone without benediction from above. It is no wonder that we hesitate to make use of the liberty that has been granted. He who has been in leading-strings for eighty years, needs time in which to learn to walk unguided.

It looks almost as if the present representatives of the Prussian Minister of Education felt themselves in conscience bound to repair the faults of their predecessors. For they do not content themselves with simply urging independence in the work of education, but are also endeavoring to educate the teachers under their supervision to be independent, directing

them to new and progressive ideas and advising practical tests. We know that the movement toward greater freedom of form in teaching, started by Prof. Paulsen of Berlin for the upper classes of the higher schools, has found its warmest supporters in the Prussian Bureau of Education. With the adoption of this idea a new avenue to freedom would be opened, which could not so easily be closed. The struggle, however, must be a long one, before the ideal, "Freedom of Initiative," will be realized. There are determined opponents who will draw the sword with strength and skill. Yet the struggle can only add to the clear understanding, strengthening and wider spreading of the idea. By this means it will not perish. The only dangerous opponent of the movement is the love of ease. He who tries to give his pupils liberty must work, must work harder and in strange ways. Pupils who voluntarily co-operate in the study of a favorite subject, will ask their teacher many a question with which he has not busied himself for a long time, and with which he would never trouble himself if everything were going in the old well trodden path of the written "pensa" and the strict following of the course of instruction.

And these questions will change with the pupils, the years and the progress of science. Thus the teacher will be compelled to sacrifice many hours of leisure in order to master his profession. Further, if, as Paulsen would like, teachers were to convene for systematic lectures on questions of general interest, such as the history of politics, of philosophy, of natural sciences and inventions, this would require still greater sacrifice of time and effort.

Teachers who are generally interested in the progress of their pupils will make this sacrifice with perfect willingness. They know that this greater burden of work will not only make them richer in intellectual treasures, but will also bring them nearer to the hearts of their pupils. They will become, outside the barriers of their office, real advisers and helpers of the young people; and this is, indeed, the finest fruit that Paulsen's idea may bear. Spontaneous co-operation will strengthen the personal relation of pupil and teacher, bringing human heart nearer to human heart. Abilities and virtues that were undiscovered in pupils because of monotony in setting tasks, asking questions and finding fault, will now be brought to light in free co-operation. On the other hand, the

teacher will find his opportunity to break, without risk, the hard rule of school discipline, and to exercise his human qualities in unrestricted intercourse with his pupils. The relation between the two is no longer that of teacher and pupil, but that of master and disciple. Love and reverence are ties that bind the disciple to the teacher, while only too often servile fear separates the pupil from the teacher. Yet, we must not forget that it will cost work to realize the true ideal. For this reason the satisfied and the easy-going will not hear of it; they would rather keep on the old road, with its guide-posts of programs.

Love of ease, in general, is the strongest support of uniformity, even of the uniformity that leads to the slough, to the ruination of progress. Let me explain what I mean by uniformity. Schools, like all public institutions, must to a certain extent be systematized. Without this no administration would be possible. As long as we do not wish to dispense with the State's support of educational work, we must submit to system in the affairs of administration. But, for centuries, the supreme authority in education has claimed the right to regulate, on general lines, the amount of school work, and to see to

it that its orders were obeyed. With this fact every teacher must reckon. The danger is that the restriction which results may become too drastic; but inside the lines that are drawn, it is possible to give the teachers enough room for development of their powers, not to impair the independence of their work. It is now their duty to make use of their liberty. Where they fail to do this, and do only what their instructions call for, or, in the absence of instruction, follow ancient usage, if, year after year, very different children are treated, or maltreated, after the same fashion, then that dangerous uniformity will grow, by which all individualism is destroyed. It is the uniformity of the patternmaker making a single pattern. This process is by no means so easily recognized as one might imagine. There are among the handy-craftsmen of our vocation many splendid disciplinarians, blameless officials as they generally are called, who know how to drill, and are always ready to show good results at the end of the year. They cover up the hollowness and flatness of their work with a superficial success. Woe to the children who are delivered up to such teachers! They are formed into creatures without independence

or will. Convinced of the excellence of their system, these handy-craftsmen are incapable of becoming absorbed in the study of the pupils' individual traits. They recklessly mould spirits of hope according to the pattern of their "well bred" method. They treat spirits *en bloc* and proudly call this proceeding just.

To be just to children is something very different from this; it is to be just to the individual child. He who, following his own judgment or simply custom, bends and trains the tender plant of childhood, may produce such queer forms as we find in the so-called "French Garden." Such forms have ceased to be natural; they are really crippled and stunted plants, a sight to fill with sadness and sorrow every normal mind. One may imagine the fate of a pupil so trained after he leaves the school and must enter upon his independent development for living his life. Bent and trimmed in the wrong way, like a little tree trained on trellis-work, he constantly looks for help and assistance. He is a feeble creature all his life, perhaps useful for the bureaucratic work of the ordinary official, but no apostle of progress for human society. He is a brick with which to build

with, but not, as Ellen Key says, "a living cell, co-operating to build living forms."

That this pattern-worker estranges teachers and pupils, or, rather, prevents their close approach to one another, is evident enough. The teacher repulses his pupils by dealing with them in ways contrary to their nature. Very few children, although some few are occasionally found, possess sufficient strength of character to rebel openly against the maltreatment to which they may be subjected. Most children will submit, but will withdraw their own personality into the sanctuary of their hearts. Thus benign influence upon the depths of the child's soul is precluded by such treatment. Teacher and pupils may walk side by side for years, without the teacher's having once sounded the depth of the children's souls. He hardly makes the effort, and the result of his work is wretched. A certain amount of knowledge destined to be forgotten, a certain culture of mind, perhaps, and hypocritical pretence,—that is all their work of years has accomplished.

He who would do fruitful work must above all take the trouble to observe the pupils, so as to judge them correctly. This is often a tiresome undertaking, requiring time and pa-

tience. It must, besides, be tactful and unobtrusive; for if the children find that they are being studied, they lose their unaffectedness. Also, such observation requires, to be worth while, sureness of vision and experience. It is necessary to discover *facts* regarding what is valuable and vital in the individuality of the child. Strength and endurance for this arduous work must come from a deep and genuine love of children; this alone assures the acquiring of freedom from prejudice in judging the child, and does not allow ugly mistrust to enter the problem.

An excellent technical method of observing children is given by Montaigne in the chapter, already mentioned, of his essays, which treats of the education of children. He says, in one place, concerning the task of the real teacher: "Sometimes he ought to assist the pupil on his way, and sometimes he must let him go his own gait. He must not always take the lead and do all the talking. He must also listen and let the pupil express himself. . . . It is well for the teacher to let the pupil trot ahead, in order to learn his fashion of walking and to judge how far he must condescend in order to reach the pupils' level in power of comprehen-

sion. If he neglects this relation he spoils everything. To find it and to conform to it is, of all the duties that I impose upon the teacher, the most imperative. And it is the evidence of a great and noble soul to bring itself down to the children's stride and be able to lead them. I tread more firmly and more securely as I climb, than as I descend the mountain."

This advice has been often repeated by pedagogical theorists, and is partially followed in practice, in so far as teachers invite, through skillful questioning, the pupil's own opinions and let him discover, from step to step, his own way to the goal of the lesson. What is called to-day the Inductive Method partially accomplishes what Montaigne means by climbing the mountain. But this does not entirely cover the inspired Frenchman's suggestion. When the teacher only asks, and leaves the answer to the child, only those thoughts will be revealed that are invited by the question. Pupils do not trot before their teacher in careless freedom, but exactly in the intended direction given by the holder of the reins. The wealth of the thought created in the minds of children by the subject of the lesson is only partially brought to actual expression, and a

series of questions that rise spontaneously in the child's mind, remains unanswered. To prevent this cramping of effort, the teacher ought to let the children come to him freely with questions.

But pupils' questions are anathema to the school-master-handy-craftsman, because they disturb the smooth running of the instruction. With a grumbling "Leave me alone with your stupid questions," he repulses the pupil who asks questions that threaten to disturb his quiet routine. Others, through unfortunate experiences, have become opponents of the sympathetic style of education. They were sometimes asked questions which they were unable to answer offhand, and it may have been disagreeable to them to confess the limitations of their knowledge. Again, they may have been so far diverted by the children's questions from the subject in hand that they could not finish the lesson in the hour.

On the other hand, the pupils are not always ready to approach the teacher with questions. Many children never ask questions because they dislike to confess that they did not understand the subject, or because they are conscious of inattention. It is therefore necessary to lead

them to ask questions, and accustom them to doing so. In order not to discourage them, we must avoid sharp criticism of their ignorance or inattention, as it sometimes seems; or refrain from ridicule. All reproof not actuated by love is out of place when the questioner betrays mental weakness. Honest intention should always be recognized and encouraged, even if it manifests itself in the most awkward form. When certain pupils try to wander from the point in asking questions of the teacher that are not related to the actual subject of the lesson, it is necessary to lead them systematically to a right way of questioning. This requires tact and skill. He who thinks himself incapable of adroitly weaving together the often disconnected and pointless questions of the pupils into the texture of his instruction, must accustom the pupils to conform their questions to things that seem to them of importance, and to ask them at a fixed, though recurring, time during the lesson. It is self-evident that answering questions is a concern not of the teacher, but of the entire class.

An excellent opportunity to observe the individuality of the child is furnished, according to an old tradition, by the joint excursions of

teachers and pupils. Rid of the fetters of school discipline, the pupils reveal themselves here more naturally than in the class. This is the stock argument in recommending these excursions, and it is correct if the members of the party are not restrained by too many and severe regulations. The benefit has become, however, rather illusory, through the rigid provisions of the "law of responsibility." Through this ordinance, school excursions have lost much of their value. The depressing sense of constant responsibility, from the first moment of the expedition to the last, lies on the teacher's mind like a nightmare, and renders intercourse with the pupils and untrammeled observation of their actions impossible. Fear of some fatal accident urges the teacher to make various rules restricting the liberty of the pupils and spoiling the unconstraint of their conduct. As long as the state and community do not offer a remedy for this state of things, the teacher cannot be blamed for avoiding these excursions, since they give neither him nor the pupils any real pleasure. There is not only the vexation of an increased supervision, but also the chance of an accident with its serious legal consequences.

The same regulations throw their shadow on the participation of teachers in the gymnasium games of the children. Being with the children in their play is, pedagogically, more valuable than the joint excursions. In the fresh, frolicsome, romping play on the meadow, the hearts of children find themselves drawn together more quickly. Besides, play is the real life element of the child; the child's heart and soul are in it. The husk of conventionality is removed, and the heart is revealed. Then, freely and without restraint, the heart of the child can be read; its purity, its individuality and its talents become manifest.

Only in the home and amid the family, does the individuality of the child show itself in the same unrestrained manner. For this reason, the teacher should seek intercourse with the pupil at home, in spite of all difficulties that unreasonable parents put in the way. If he succeeds in overcoming them and convincing the parents of the fact that closer relations between home and school bring only good to the child, he may reap a rich harvest from the close intercourse thus gained. He will learn of talents and interests, the possession of which the child had never betrayed at school. He will gain an

insight into the child's method of work and capacity for work. He will make acquaintance with the spiritual atmosphere surrounding the child. He will understand the weaknesses and faults of the youthful soul, that have been an everlasting source of vexation to him, and will forgive them. And when the child has found out that the teacher is not indifferent to his little cares and joys, even if they concern matters apart from school and lessons, he will repay his teacher's sympathy with confidence and grateful affection.

Nor have we as yet exhausted the possibilities in the matter of an exploration of the child's mind. In daily intercourse with his pupils the educator who has a watchful eye, finds a thousand opportunities to gain insight into the nature of his pupils, so that the teacher, who is honestly striving to do so, will succeed in correctly judging the individual pupil and in treating him according to his natural gifts. The professional activity of a man who tries to become just to the varied natures of his pupils, is filled with confidence and kindness. These are qualities for which we look in vain in the carefully modeled lessons of the school-master-handy-craftsman. Though the material which

the professionally active teacher treats is, year in and year out, the same, it receives continually fresh life through the improvement of the pupils as they practice and strengthen their youthful powers with the given tasks. The charm of personality can render attractive even the driest and dullest subject of instruction.

IX

School and Home

WE spoke, at the end of the last chapter, of the relations of the school and the home, and the importance to the school of the training in the home. These things have also been mentioned elsewhere in this book. The subject, however, could only be touched upon hitherto, but it is sufficiently important to demand fuller consideration.

When the child enters school for the first time, his character is not an unwritten page. In lines that are indelible, the spirit of the home is engraved upon the child's soul, and this spirit persists in the developing boy or girl, as long as school-days last. This makes it clear that the educational influence of the family may materially help the work of the school, and, on the contrary, may greatly hinder the school work. Alas!—and this we state frankly at the beginning of our discussion—the hindrance of this influence to the school work is far more perceptible than the assistance which it affords.

The opponents of our present school system are rather inclined, for their own purposes, to profit by the conflict of home and school, ever lauding the work of the family to excess and underrating that of the school. Their statements find eager listeners far and wide, for all people have something to criticise in the school; the home, to many, is a "*noli me tangere*" and the blessing of its influence seems to them beyond cavil.

The reason for this feeling is not far to seek. Home, family association with parents, are magic words, and easily appear to us in poetical aspect. Their sound recalls a thousand pleasant memories of childhood. The thought of parents, brothers and sisters, joyous play and care-free life under the protection of father and mother, befog the mind and bias us when we try to weigh home education against school education. The poets and artists never tire of glorification of the mother's love, in works and paintings; and we join with them in this most heartily, because we ourselves have known the benediction of that love.

Even if we suppress our natural sympathy for the home, and judge neutrally, we must admit that the home can accomplish more, educationally, than the school. The intimacy of

the intercourse between the parents and children, the mutual understanding and many-sidedness of relations between these two, the long continuance and constancy of this educational influence, the whole organization of domestic life, with the solid order, discipline and morals: all these virtues make the home an educational institution of the first rank, with which the school would enter into hopeless competition—if this means were really used for good. In many, many families this is not the case. A great many parents do not know how to use the educational riches at their disposal, and so the home does not really do what it might.

What is called home training is, when closely scanned, found to be a thing of many shapes and forms. There are as many educational schemes favored by parents as there are individual homes. Yet it is true that certain fundamental forms recur, and with them certain defects. There are many families, especially among the ignorant, in which education is limited to mere tradition of parental qualities and habits. The power of example appears there in its full strength. It may be a blessing for the children, or it may become a curse, ac-

154 The Way to the Heart of the Pupil
cording to the nature, the acts and the dealings
of the parents.

Elsewhere, educational principles are applied with intelligence; but parents lack the required insight and firmness in the application of their rules. They forbid to-day, this, to-morrow that, and perhaps both are allowed the day after to-morrow. Paternal whims and humors change like April weather; excessive severity and weak indulgence alternate in gay confusion. No wonder if children become just such inconsistent and inconstant creatures as their domestic models. Some parents in their educational fervor cannot do enough. They give their children no rest, but drive and pursue them from morning till night. They are always teaching, criticising, reproving and punishing. They wish to force their young plants with hot-house growth, and therefore demand of them at every turn what they are simply unable to do. They rob their children of their most precious treasure, the harmless joyousness of childhood. By their excessive zeal they produce cowed, depressed and, what is still worse, listless and false men and women.

In many families fathers and mothers differ in their views regarding education, and this

discord undoubtedly injures the development of the child's character. The father wishes this, the mother that. If he is too hard and unyielding, so is she too kind-hearted and gentle; if he forbids a thing, she permits it; if he blusters and storms on the slightest occasion, she feels bound to make up for his cruelty with honeycake and caresses. The children soon find out that their parents do not pull together, especially if quarrels are carried on in the youngsters' presence. With natural slyness they try to profit by the parents' disagreement. They cannot be blamed if they hide behind whichever parent protects them, at every prohibition and order that they dislike, and at every punishment which they have to fear. But we might expect of the parents sufficient intelligence to know that their training of their children must fail, if unanimity does not prevail in the assertion of their will. Nay, the parent that takes the child's part never gets any thanks for doing so. On the contrary, when on some occasion he wishes to enforce his will, he does not succeed without threatening that the other parent, the more energetic, will intervene. "I'll tell this to Papa!" Who hasn't heard this plaintive confession of maternal help-

lessness? And who has found a mother who felt ashamed of degrading the father to a Bogeypman, to frighten the callous youngsters?

Now too much and now too little, here too severe and there too easy, and at the same time often too indefinite, too irregular, too contradictory—thus may the faults most common in home training be summed up. These are the deficiencies of which there has been complaint among all civilized nations. To our time, however, it was left to bruit about one of these defects—that of “too little” more than any preceding age, and make known what Ellen Key properly calls “domestic homelessness.” While in former times only the fathers were drawn away from their homes during the day by profession or business, now-a-days only too often mothers absent themselves from the place where they ought to be indispensable. The poor and the lower class are turned out in quest of daily bread; the well-to-do, by social life with its allurements. Also the occupations of women, brought about by their emancipation, do not allow many mothers rest nor satisfaction in their homes. The theatres, concerts, parties, places of amusement and golf links no longer satisfy the female ambition. In the assemblies,

the lecture halls, the club houses they have conquered a firm place and from year to year their numbers become larger there. We shall not dispute with them this hard won possession; women without responsibilities may enjoy it undisturbed. But it is deplorable that the mania for amusement, for meetings and for lectures, that has taken hold upon the modern women distracts mothers also, in an increasing degree, from their real vocation, the care and guidance of the children. It is generally recognized that the neglect of the home by the working class, which has surely its plain reason in the pressure of life, is dangerous. Endeavors are made to find substitutes for the home training, thus lost, in boarding houses for foundlings and orphans, kindergartens, and homes for boys and girls. But among the philanthropic women who so willingly contribute to these charities and show their good will by rich donations, are found many mothers whose children are not in much better spiritual and moral condition than the children of the poor laborers. There are well-to-do families in which the mothers place the care and education of the children in the hands of others. The nurse, or the maid with the nursing-bottle, must re-

lieve her of a mother's most sacred duty. Nursery maids and *bonnes* accompany the poor larvæ through the early years of childhood, and when they have no longer any authority, the governess takes their place:—all strangers, changing with the years, often with the months, without any intimate personal connection with the young creatures. The parents become estranged from the children of their own household. The children become homeless—as much so as the laborer's children, who, abandoned by father and mother, grow up without training in their parents' house.

Many, however, hold the opinion that the defects of home training, which we have mentioned, have no especially serious consequence if parents and children share in their hearts a treasure that counterbalances these deficiencies, mutual love. Surely the love of children for parents and of parents for children is a precious and almost inexhaustible treasure, and its educational importance cannot be overestimated. But nothing in this world is so precious and so sublime as not to be misused and misdirected by man—even love. It becomes with many parents, not love, but foolish fondness, an ugly mixture of pure love, weakness, desire for com-

fort, vanity and self complacency; such parents place their child above all other considerations, because it is *their* child. They admire the child because they see in it their own image; they adore themselves in their offspring. They overlook or excuse their child's faults because their vanity has blinded them. They grant all the child's whims and conform to all his wishes, because they like to avoid every unpleasant coolness between themselves and the object of their fond affections. They coddle and spoil the child because they are intent only on its and their immediate welfare. What will be the result of this weak and short-sighted policy? A selfish, self-willed creature, unable to deny itself anything or to endure another's opinion, a tyrant to its own parents, whose foolish fondness it usually repays with absence of affection.

If I have presented the faults of home training with elaboration, I have done so because these faults explain and confirm the opinion expressed above that home training has a harmful influence upon the education of the school. The defects in home training are an abundant but frequently hidden source of unpleasantness and quarrels between the teacher and pupil. If it is

not safe always to infer laxness at home from bad conduct, laziness and negligence of the school child, it is still quite evident that children who lack the sure, clear-headed guidance of parents cause more trouble and irritation to the teacher than those who are well trained at home. The common expression for ill-mannered, impertinent children is "obstinate and ill bred"; for capricious children "spoiled!" The teacher who regards it as his duty not only to punish but also to discover the cause of the offense, in order to apply the remedy for the evil at its source, cannot neglect the domestic surroundings of his pupils. He must try to get into touch with the home, in order to get an insight into the character, the conduct and, above all, into the educational ideas of the parents. "I can no longer condemn this pupil; I can only sympathize with him," declared one of my colleagues, after he had, by chance, become acquainted with the parents and the home of a pupil frequently punished. After visiting the home, he had been able to judge the boy correctly. Many a boy would be judged and treated differently, if the teacher gained an insight into his domestic relations.

Whether the teacher will always succeed in

exercising a good influence upon the parents who neglect their children, is another question. The young tree bends, but the old tree no longer bends. In that case his friendly advice, his earnest admonition, and his pointing out of the dangerous consequences of neglect will be of no avail, even if they are accepted at all, or recognized as just. Indeed, the teacher has no formal right to intervene in unfortunate domestic conditions. As this is known to every one, there will be many parents who absolutely refuse to allow any interference with their domestic relations, while others again never admit the deficiencies of their mode of training their children. And this may be thoroughly sincere, for belief in the excellence of their way of teaching their children is general among parents, even among those whose unfitness is evident to others. This confidence is so firmly seated, that even when children are evidently spoiled and their training a failure, the parents attribute the cause to a hundred different sources—never to themselves.

Still, the attempt to influence the home is not entirely hopeless. While those who most need advice, reject it, there are others more reasonable, who are hospitable to argument and to

warnings from the teacher. He is able, if only he has tact, to tell many useful truths to fathers and mothers without offending them. He may influence them to dispense with some abuses without creating the unpleasant impression of reprobating them. He may grant that the measures adopted by them are in general good and praiseworthy, but not advisable in the case of their particular child with his peculiar nature. He will secure the best results when he can point out definite remedies. Where parental negligence has been evident, especially in the case of the pupils of the higher schools, the teacher may exercise a strong influence upon the parents through the fear of the child's failing of promotion. The hope of graduation of the child will make parents accessible to earnest remonstrance.

The deficiencies of home training are not the only reason for the teacher's endeavoring to get into contact with the family. Just as the parents make mistakes in training their children, the teachers make mistakes in their judgment and treatment of the pupils. We have already pointed out, in the preceding chapter, how difficult it is to judge pupils correctly by their conduct in the class room, and how easily

we may, by unjust treatment, close the way to the child's heart. We are warning the teacher against continually drawing conclusions as to want of diligence from poor work in lessons, and against interpreting every offense against school regulations as evidence of malice. We have stated it as our opinion that contact with the home is for that reason indispensable. Then the teacher will get many a hint from the home concerning the pupil's diligence, as well as his method of work and his conduct. He will learn of helps and hindrances hitherto unknown to him, and will become acquainted with the pupil's pastimes, sports and choice of friends. He will learn something of the pupil's general health, his physical defects and, also,—a matter of great importance,—of former diseases and their consequences. All this is information for which a tender-hearted teacher will be grateful to the home, because he can make use of it in his judgment and his treatment of his pupils.*

* An innovation recently (1906), introduced into the school administration of Augsburg is very praiseworthy. Here is issued, as reported, a series of questions to parents of children promoted to the Volkschule, in order to obtain information regarding former diseases, accidents, and bodily or mental defects. These answers are treated as strictly confidential. They are to lead the teacher to pay proper attention to pupil's natural handicaps,

Finally, we are interested that our work as teachers should be justly valued and judged in the home. The conception which the parents form of the school from their children's description is usually shadowy and in some way distorted. Children are inclined to report the little joys and sorrows occasioned in their intercourse with their fellow-pupils, or else the school gossip. In the latter, as we know, truth is generally mixed in homeopathic doses with mendacious exaggeration and falsification. Of their own work and their relations with their teachers, children will generally tell only when asked, and then, according to their story, everything went well,—very well. If it has not been so, and some offense or deficiency cannot be concealed, then some children show astonishing facility in falsifying facts. This is also done at the end of the quarter or school year, when the report cards appear and waken the careless and confiding parents out of their dream. Then some pupils will not hesitate to tell any falsehood or shift any blame, if only they can succeed in covering up their shortcomings. It is

and guard him against too severe requirements and unjust punishment. After a while, the school physician will be the indispensable friendly adviser of the teacher.

true that many parents will discover the attempted deception and properly disregard it, but others are rather inclined to accept what the child says as true because they are blinded by foolish fondness, and do not think their son capable of a gross falsehood. Their own son never lies. Their vanity would make the other person responsible rather than blame their own children. Also, small souls are inclined to believe slander.

It would be false pride if the teacher, conscious of having done his duty, should be indifferent to these misunderstandings and misinterpretations. Yet he cannot dispense with the co-operation of the home. If, however, the parents think evil of the teacher, and see in him an enemy and oppressor of their children, then, instead of the desired co-operation, an ugly opposition arises in the home, which manifests itself in unfriendly criticism of the school, in sneering and sarcastic remarks about the teacher and his methods. When parents do not conceal their opposition to the school, the very best will of the teacher and the most friendly advances of love will not find their way to the closed heart of the child.

There are really many reasons which force the teacher to cultivate intercourse with the home.

He cannot, of course, always be expected to call on the many families whose children are in his care. He must be the judge whether a call is necessary or not. For the rest, it is no farther from the home to the school than from the school to the home, and the parents' interest is as great as the teachers, if their reciprocal relations are rightly understood. Thinking parents do not shun visiting the school. They know that they can there obtain advice and assistance. There they find exact information regarding their child's work and conduct, which will guard them against disastrous carelessness and secure redress when they think their child falsely estimated. There differences of opinion of every description can be adjusted in sensible discussion. The provision of a weekly office hour for parents, as required in Prussia and several other States for several years, has made the way to school much easier to many parents and has cured of false modesty many who before feared making themselves a nuisance with their visits. The success of the hours for conversation would be greater if they were advertised through written notices to parents or through notices in the local papers and not through the children.

If parents who need an understanding with the teacher cannot thus be induced to come to the school, a special written invitation should be sent them. If after that the proffered hand should be disregarded the teacher has at least done his duty. The parents themselves are responsible for the alienation of interests.

Unquestionably, an understanding between school and home is much easier in towns and villages than in large cities. In small communities the teacher soon becomes acquainted with the inhabitants and there are many occasions for conversation concerning the school children. Within the boundaries of the large city long distances separate people from each other, and the rush of business hinders from seeking an understanding with the teacher those who must economize even their time. Yet in this case the understanding is most needed. The influence of life in a big city often works against home and school; these two institutions ought on this account to be more closely united in their joint work. They must combine to draw the children from the many dangers with which the surroundings in a large city threaten them.

The visit to the home by an elementary teacher in city schools would be especially bene-

ficial. A considerable part of his pupils belong to the poorest classes of the population. He often has great difficulty with his pupils. He has to struggle against passion and annoyances of which the teacher of the higher schools has no idea. But he will the sooner overcome these difficulties, if he discover their hidden sources. These sources usually are to be found in the home. Therefore, you educators of the people, look to the places where your pupils live; look into the halls and rooms which they call their home; learn the need and misery with which their parents must contend and, if you do so, you will meet your pupils with understanding eyes and warmer hearts. You cannot drive this misery out of the world, but you learn charity when you perceive what shadows that misery casts upon the school.

As for the rest, it cannot be denied that the knowledge of this necessity for mutual understanding between school and home is gaining among us more and more. The school authorities especially are now-a-days trying to interest the home in the work of the school, and to encourage the home to more energetic co-operation in the common cause. Most directors of higher schools point out in their annual reports the

necessity of a sensible co-operation between the two, and invite the parents to confidential talks with the teachers. In all schools, the annual festivities offer a favorable occasion to strengthen sentiments of mutual esteem and mutual interest. Here and there principals arrange joint excursions to which the families are invited. In other places parents' evenings have been arranged, which enable the parents to become acquainted with one another and with the teachers, listen to lectures on educational questions and inform themselves personally regarding the work and conduct of their children, so that differences of opinion upon these and other matters may be settled. The establishment of a parents' council has also been tried. A committee, chosen by the parents from among themselves, or elected from the community, represents the desire of the home with regard to the school, and mediates between the school and the family. The success of this plan, however, did not fulfill expectations. Still, the attempt shows, as does that previously mentioned, that there is no lack of good will in teachers' circles in this matter of a good understanding with the home.

Further, one thing must not be forgotten;

there is one state of feeling, which shared by teachers and parents, renders personal intercourse between them superfluous. Where faithful parents' eyes watch and guard the children, where strong hands kindly and safely lead them, where father and mother by principle and example educate the young to industry, modesty, piety, morality and reverence, there no need exists of consultation between parents and teachers; the co-ordination of work in home and in school is already accomplished. It is only when this harmony exists that, as Willmann says, "the united efforts of both reach the depths of the soul, where sentiments ripen and the seeds of character slumber."

X

Efforts toward Reform and the Assuming of Responsibility

LONG with his position, the teacher has imposed upon him a manifold responsibility. He owes this responsibility to the state, to the parents, to the public and, finally, to God and his conscience. But while this responsibility is a matter of ideals as compared with other factors of the teacher's problem, and seldom comes to the surface, so far as it is owed to the state, it is evident in all its steps. The state reminds the teacher of the obedience that he owes it, by laws, regulations and ordinances, by its courses of study and by its supervision. The state will not and cannot, according to the development of the school system in Germany, dispense with its right to require educational officials to account to the state. The question is only how far the state should go in this matter. It is usually greeted as a sign of a good administration when the authorities insist strictly upon a conscientious

supervision, investigation, study and direction of the subordinate officials. But the bow should not be drawn too far. The authorities only injure the good cause, if they let supervision and guidance of subordinates degenerate into tutelage. When responsibility is weakened, this means injury to the school system which all official zeal cannot again repair.

What, for instance, will a school principal accomplish, who regards himself as bound to regulate his teachers by a rigid set of rules which he thinks the best. In the best event, the teachers will submit to his regulations and work as he commands. But they will beware of doing more, for they would run the risk of everything being disapproved of by the superior, that they did on their own initiative. Why should they expose themselves to blame when they can satisfy their principal in an easier way? They then enjoy, besides, the comfort of hiding, in critical cases, behind the authority of the principal.

The over-zealous administrator accomplishes the opposite of that for which he is striving. He wishes to further the conscientious work of his teachers; in fact, he smothers in them the sense of responsibility to their own conscience. The work of his colleagues will be-

come, instead of more intense, more superficial and perfunctory. The question of the principal's approval will be the most important for the teacher, and not the question of his personal relations with his pupils.

How is it with the contentment and joy of working on the part of the teacher, under such circumstances? Man's supreme satisfaction rests upon a consciousness of independence. What he accomplishes by his own ability gives him purest joy. He resents it as an affront to his moral dignity always to be in leading-strings, like a child. By too much tutelage there may indeed be created a comfortable solidarity, but not such as finds its inner satisfaction in the work of the school. How can the pupils find pleasure in their work, if the teachers who are to lead them by good example, appear dissatisfied and discontented?

A large share of responsibility for this excessive administrative zeal is due to public opinion. Public opinion, that great and only irresponsible force, regards itself bound to nobody, strikes first, when it is dissatisfied with our school development, at the board of education and institutions created by them. The public knows that the state makes school laws, that the state's

administrative machinery makes the course of study and that the state regulates and supervises the entire organization of our school system. In the hands of the state lies everything. So runs the daily paper; thus the tune of the educational reformers, the party-speakers, the qualified and the unqualified, the reasonable and the unreasonable, conscientious friends of the people and habitual grumblers. They criticise this, they criticise that, they hunt and harass, they roar and they abuse. However their opinion may differ, they are all united in one thing—the direction of their demands.

But the direction is a false one. I can be made responsible only so far as my power extends. Even the state is not almighty. It is answerable for the external organization, which it has created, but not for the spirit that lives in the organization, which, after all, is the most important thing. When anyone deems reforms necessary, he should address himself to that spiritual life-principle which is at work in schools. This life-principle is incorporated in the teachers. They are the soul of our public schools; they represent the real value of these schools; with them stands or falls the school.

This should be especially emphasized in the

face of zeal for reform. We live in a time hospitable to reform. The number of reforms in our school system proposed during the last few decades, and now proposed every day by doctrinaires and opportunist reformers, has become legion. We may rejoice at this or not, but it is at any rate evidence of great mental activity in our people and of warm sympathy with efforts for the welfare of youth. If we look closely at these propositions of reform, we find that most of them antagonize prescription and circumscription of subjects of study offered to the children, or they are opposed to the methods or to the hygienic arrangements, or finally, to the organization of the school's system in general. The majority of reformers stick to the present constitution of the school and await, in the improvement of these institutions, the dawn of a more beautiful and a happier future.

I take the liberty of doubting the realization of this hope. There have been many reforms in our school system since the days of humanism, and the efforts of former school reformers were narrowed to the same points, where reform is as much needed now as then: the selection of subjects of instruction, the mode of

teaching, and, at least for the last centuries, school hygiene and the entire organization of our educational system. Yet all these reforms have failed to banish from school the discontent and discomfort that for centuries have burdened those who have been confined to them, teachers and pupils. Why failed? Because these reforms have aimed only at things, at institutions, and not at men. There is only one great reform which can make the school really a place of joy and comfort, and that is the reform of the human heart. Were this not effected, all reform and modernization would be only patchwork; new pieces would be inserted in an old fabric. The new reform cannot be decreed from higher authority; nothing from outside can help us to it; we must accomplish it in ourselves.

Thus I come back again to what I emphasized at the end of the first chapter. The welfare of the school does not depend upon external reform, but upon powers that reside in the breast of man. These powers have accomplished wonders. Centuries ago they enabled the teacher to draw his pupils to him with invisible arms; they will secure him, for all the future, grateful and industrious pupils.

I may be permitted in conclusion a short comparison. Every one knows the delightful stories that tell of the stupidity of the inhabitants of Schilda. One of them is especially impressive. The good citizens of Schilda had completed the building of the Rathaus, when they discovered with alarm that they had forgotten the greatest necessity, the light. They then tried to catch it in sacks, with spade and shovel, and with mouse-traps so as to convey it into the dark building. They had as little success as we shall have in providing our schools, by elaborate hygienic material and methodic reform, with the best and the most necessary thing, with light and warmth. These delightful accessories give life to our schoolrooms only if the teachers themselves carry the sun of love in their hearts.

I think it unworthy of a genuine teacher when, sighing under the burdens of school life, he joins in the common cry for official reforms, as if from them alone salvation can come. Criticism of existing conditions is certainly good and productive, and we are grateful to all who have the courage to point out the real abuses in our school system; they thus preserve it from destruction and from corruption. But the most

beneficial criticism is self-criticism. It is like a refreshing blast sweeping away from head and heart hoary old prejudices. Heart-searching makes us able to change. Therefore self-criticism is the necessary preliminary to the betterment, somewhere on earth, of human society.

Let every one in school life look first into himself and at his work. Let him ask himself how he stands with his pupils, what hitherto he has been to them and what he can be to them in the future. Let him make of his teaching a personal matter. Then his work will be crowned with success.

